

Also, the resolutions of the Board of Managers of the Commercial Exchange, and the resolutions of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, protesting against the extension of the steam grain-shovel patent—severally to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: The petition of honorably discharged soldiers of the late war, residing in Cambria County, Pennsylvania, for the passage of the bill to establish a soldiers' home at Erie, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIN: The petition of citizens of Pennsylvania for the passage of the bill to establish a soldiers' home at Erie, Pennsylvania—to the same committee.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill for the improvement of Apalachicola Bay, of the Choctawhatchie River, of the Tampa Bay, of the Withlacoochie River, of Peace Creek, of the Escambia River, and of Pensacola Harbor, in the State of Florida—severally to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE R. DAVIS: The petition of officers of the United States Army, relative to allowance or commutation for fuel, &c.—severally to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOWER: Memorial of the German Society of the city of New York, for legislation for the protection of arriving immigrants—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARDENBERGH: The petition of the National Tobacco Company, relative to the abolition of export stamps and exportation of tobacco; and also a protest against the passage of a free-leaf tobacco bill—severally to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of various boards of trade, chambers of commerce, commercial exchanges, &c., for the passage of the Lowell bill to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN: Papers relating to the claim of Jane M. Goodall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEAL: The petition of Captain James B. Bazell, for relief—to the same committee.

By Mr. O'NEILL: The resolutions of the Commercial Exchange and the resolutions of the Board of Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, protesting against the extension of the steam grain-shovel patent—severally to the Committee on Patents.

Also, the resolutions of the Philadelphia County Medical Society, urging the passage of the bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—to the Committee on the Public Health.

By Mr. RANDALL: The resolutions of the board of managers of the Commercial Exchange and of the board of managers of the Maritime Exchange of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, protesting against the extension of the patents on steam grain-shovels—severally to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. AMOS TOWNSEND: The petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the extension of the steam grain-shovel patent—to the same committee.

By Mr. OSCAR TURNER: The petition of the mayor, council, and citizens of Columbus, Kentucky, for an appropriation to protect said place from the encroachments of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Levees and Improvement of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. UPSON: The petition of Bernard Smith, to be relieved from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANCE: Papers relating to the claim of the heirs of W. Bulloch—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WATSON: The petition of various boards of trade and other commercial organizations, for the passage of the Lowell bill to establish a uniform law of bankruptcy throughout the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER A. WOOD: The petition of citizens of Greenwich, New York, for the repeal of the law imposing a tax on bank deposits and the two-cent stamp on bank-checks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the petition of Joseph Magoffin and others, citizens of El Paso, Texas, for an appropriation to construct an approach to Fort Bliss, was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, papers relating to the claim of George L. Key were reported from the Committee on Military Affairs and referred to the Committee on Claims.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 30, 1882.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated 24th instant, in relation to the urgent necessity of action on the part of Congress for the more adequate prevention of trespasses upon Indian lands, with copy of

report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs upon the subject, and draft of a bill for the object indicated. The subject is commended to the consideration of Congress.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 29, 1882.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* also laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a communication from the Secretary of War, dated March 25, 1882, with accompanying correspondence, plans, and estimates, in which he recommends an appropriation of \$40,000 for the completion of the new post at Fort Lewis, Colorado.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 29, 1882.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of Lieutenant-Colonel G. K. Warren, Corps of Engineers, containing information called for by a resolution of the 17th instant, in relation to the estimates of the cost of increasing the depth of the main ship channel of Providence River and harbor.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the report be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce; and I present a memorial of the State harbor commissioners of Rhode Island, resolutions of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, and a memorial of the mayor of the city of Providence and of the Providence Board of Trade bearing upon the same subject, which I move be referred and printed with the report of the Secretary of War.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in compliance with a resolution of the Senate of March 20, 1882, such information as has been collected by the Bureau of Navigation relating to the maritime canal at Suez, which, on motion of Mr. MILLER, of California, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of United States gaugers and storekeepers of the fifth district of Illinois, praying that they be placed on the same footing with other Treasury officials, who are allowed thirty days' leave of absence annually without loss of pay; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BLAIR presented a petition of the Grand Lodge of Good Templars of New Hampshire, representing 3,000 members, praying for an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages throughout the national domain; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LAPHAM presented a memorial of business firms of the city of Rochester, New York, in favor of the passage of the bankruptcy bill known as the Lowell bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of cotton merchants and others, citizens of Macon, Georgia, and a petition of railroad men and railroad employes of Macon, Georgia, praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of Savannah, in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PENDLETON presented a petition of the Grand Division of Sons of Temperance of Ohio, representing 4,000 members, praying for an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages throughout the national domain; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAWES. I present the petition of E. R. Mudge, Sawyer & Co., and a large number of other merchants of the city of Boston, praying for the passage of the bankruptcy bill known as the Lowell bill, or any other bill that may be before Congress having the general features of that bill. This petition represents not only the interests of large merchants but the experience of most intelligent gentlemen of that class, derived from their dealings in all parts of the country, and sets forth what they deem essential features of any bankrupt bill to form a permanent system.

As this matter has already been reported upon, I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VANCE. I present the petition of "The Little Sisters of the Poor," a charitable institution of this city, praying that an act may be passed authorizing the closing of an alley, and that they be relieved from the payment of special improvement taxes to the District of Columbia. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of George S. Case, W. L. Hickman, and others, citizens of Saint Louis, Missouri, praying for such legislation as will protect the land in what is known as Sawyer's Bend, between the water-works in North Saint Louis and the northern limits of the city, from the abrasion caused by the waters of the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of John D. Hinchel, of Missouri, praying for the passage of the bill (S. No. 1012) granting pensions to certain Union soldiers of the late war of the rebellion who were confined in the co-called confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COKE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 1608) authorizing the Texas and Saint Louis Railway Company to build certain bridges in the State of Arkansas, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 978) authorizing the Texas and Saint Louis Railway Company to build certain bridges in the State of Arkansas, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FARLEY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 795) to allow the construction of a bridge across the Willamette River at Portland, in the State of Oregon, to report it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McMILLAN. I desire to state that that is a majority report merely.

Mr. FARLEY. It is a report of a majority of the committee.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 4454) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Keithsburg, in the State of Illinois, and to establish it as a post-road, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 777) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Keithsburg, in the State of Illinois, and to establish it as a post-road, asked to be discharged from its further consideration; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. VAN WYCK, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 1492) for the relief of settlers and purchasers of lands on the public domain in the State of Nebraska, reported it with an amendment; and obtained leave to submit a report in writing at some future day.

Mr. LAPHAM. A few days since the manuscript of arguments made before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, January 23, 1880, on the subject of a constitutional amendment in relation to female suffrage was referred to the select committee on that subject. I am instructed by that committee to move that the manuscript be printed for the use of the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

## POTOMAC RIVER OWNERSHIP.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Attorney-General be, and is hereby, directed to investigate and report to the Senate, at the earliest day possible, who are the owners of the lands on the Virginia and Maryland shores opposite Conn's Island, above the Great Falls in the Potomac River, and who are the owners of Conn's Island, and who are the owners of the water, water-power, and privileges at the Great Falls on said river.

## RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH MEXICO.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution, submitted February 6, 1882, in reference to Mexican reciprocity, reported it with amendments to make it read:

*Resolved by the Senate, (the House of Representatives concurring.)* That the increasing commercial intercourse between the people of Mexico and of the United States, and the relations of friendship and good-will between the two great republics now so happily existing and so gratifying to the people of both countries, make it proper that the trade and commerce of the two countries, whether on overland routes or by sea, in the ships owned by citizens of either country, should be increased and placed by mutual legislation upon a more reciprocal basis and such as will be equally advantageous to both countries. And the President is requested to bring this subject to the attention of the Government of Mexico.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MILLER, of California, asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1610) for the relief of C. N. Felton, late assistant treasurer of the United States at San Francisco, California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin, asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1611) to regulate the terms of court in the western district of Wisconsin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VANCE asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1612) to provide for the closing of an alley in square 751 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and for the relief of the Little Sisters of the Poor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1613) to prohibit the importation of neat cattle from the Dominion of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ALDRICH asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1614) making an appropriation for the erection of a light-house at or near Sakonnet Point, Rhode Island; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. VEST, Mr. KELLOGG, and Mr. COKE as the conferees on the part of the Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. No. 308) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the most accessible point within five miles above the city of Saint Charles, Missouri.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAMS, it was

*Ordered*, That the papers in the case of W. A. Wilson, of Washington, District of Columbia, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, subject to the rules.

## SOLDIERS' HOME GROUNDS.

Mr. CONGER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs be directed to inquire by whose order and for what reason the west entrance to the Soldiers' Home grounds is closed and admission to the grounds through the same forbidden.

## NANCY LEONARD.

Mr. FRYE. The bill (S. No. 736) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Nancy Leonard was passed over yesterday without prejudice when it was reached on the Calendar. I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions. The Senator who reported the bill adversely [Mr. PLATT] has no objection to a recommitment. I make the motion on the ground that additional testimony has been forwarded and is now before the House committee.

The motion was agreed to.

## EUGENE WELLS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business the morning hour is closed, and the first case under the Anthony rule will be reported, which was partly considered yesterday.

Mr. INGALLS. Under the stipulation made yesterday, the bill (S. No. 1120) for the relief of Eugene B. Allen, was to retain its place on the Calendar and be considered first under the Anthony rule.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senate bill No. 416 was partly considered yesterday, and it is better to go on with the bill which has been partly considered and then go back to the other bill as soon as it is disposed of. It has been the ruling that a bill which has been partly considered under the Anthony rule should be finished before taking up a bill which may have been placed at the head of the Calendar.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. No. 416) for the relief of Eugene Wells, the pending question being on the amendment submitted by Mr. PLUMB to the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, to strike out, after the word "Army," in line 8 of the amendment of the committee, down to and including the word "seventy-seven," in line 10, as follows:

In the same grade and rank of second lieutenant held by him on the 13th day of October, in the year 1877.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the amendment to the amendment will not prevail. The words proposed to be stricken out were inserted by the committee, and the bill is amply guarded as it stands.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not want to prevent the passage of a bill by the Senate, especially a bill for the relief of a single person, by my solitary veto; but I must protest against the passage of bills like this. I believe they tend to demoralize the Army.

This gentleman, whom I do not know, and therefore I am entirely impersonal about it, was court-martialed for drunkenness. No court-martial officers ever pronounced a man guilty of a charge and condemned him to dismissal from the Army unless there was good ground for it, and upon clear and satisfactory proof. Their mere recommendation to mercy is a natural consequence of the general cordial feeling among officers of the Army. I have heard officers of the Army speak of this very often.

It seems from the report which has been read that this gentleman was an officer of the Army at the beginning of the civil war. He served without much promotion for some ten or twelve years, and then voluntarily retired, and received no doubt one year's extra pay, he having advanced only to the grade of captain. Then he was reappointed in the Army to the grade of second lieutenant, and after serving a few years was court-martialed for drunkenness—drunkenness on duty is the charge—and was recommended to the tender mercies of the reviewing officers. The reviewing officers undoubtedly approved the finding of the court-martial, and he went out of the Army. Now it is proposed to put back in the Army an officer who entered the Army originally more than twenty years ago. It seems to me that an example of that kind, followed by other cases of a like character, would tend to demoralize the Army. Therefore, I wish simply to record my vote in the negative on the passage of the bill.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, the observations made by the Senator from Ohio must commend themselves strongly to every person who is familiar with what has been done in this direction during the past five years. I agree with him fully in saying that nothing can tend more to destroy the morale of the Army and degrade its dignity and render it useless and helpless, and also destroy the self-respect of those who obey the rules and laws of war than this constant attempt to overcome the verdicts of courts-martial, either by Presidential clemency or by acts of legislation.



I have on previous occasions called the attention of the Senate to what has been done in this direction hitherto. I have just obtained a list from the records of courts-martial of what was done during the administration of President Hayes in respect to the mitigation and remission of sentences of courts-martial for drunkenness. In the year 1877 there were twenty sentences of dismissal from the Army for drunkenness by the decision of courts-martial. Of these, twelve were reversed by the President. In 1878 there were six sentences of dismissal; and of these one was remitted. In 1879 there were six dismissals, of which four were reversed by the President. In 1880 there were nine sentences of dismissal, of which five were reversed by the President. In 1881, one sentence, which was reversed. Making, during the administration of President Hayes, a total of forty-two sentences of dismissal from the service for drunkenness, of which twenty-three were reversed and nineteen allowed to stand. How many must be added to these by acts of Congress like that which is at present before the Senate I do not know, but I leave these facts which I have read without further comment as to the course that has been pursued in regard to the preservation and protection of the honor and dignity of the Army of the United States.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I have nothing to say in defense of the practice, I may term it, which has grown up in the Senate of commuting to a certain extent the judgments of courts-martial in cases like the present. I appreciate, to the fullest extent, the objection made by the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. SHERMAN;] but, sir, this is an exceptional case. The evidence in the case, if the Senator from Ohio will take the trouble to examine it, shows that the judgment of the court-martial itself was based upon the very flimsiest sort of testimony, and was rendered with so much doubt by the officers composing the court that they afterwards sent to the Secretary of War, and to the President, the following recommendation:

GENERAL COURT-MARTIAL ROOMS, WILKESBARRE, PENNSYLVANIA,  
September 4, 1877.

We, the undersigned, members of the general court-martial in the case of Lieutenant Eugene Wells, First Artillery, do hereby unite in recommending the accused to the clemency of the reviewing authority.

WM. SINCLAIR,  
Captain, Third Artillery.  
A. M. MILLER,  
Captain, Corps of Engineers.  
GEORGE A. THURSTON,  
First Lieutenant, Third Artillery.  
CHAS. HUMPHREYS,  
Second Lieutenant, Third Artillery.  
JOHN R. WILLIAMS,  
Captain, Third Artillery.  
HEMAN DOWD,  
Second Lieutenant, Third Artillery.

Official copy:

W. M. DUNN,  
Judge-Advocate-General.

I shall not undertake to go into the testimony in detail, nor to read to the Senate the testimonials in regard to this officer's gallantry and his high character as a military man during the war. I assert, however, that the evidence shows that the judgment was rendered with the greatest hesitation and reluctance by the court, and, as I have already read, he was recommended to the clemency of the Executive, and the case has stood thus from that day to this.

Since that time Lieutenant Wells has been in the civil employment of the Government. He was a soldier; he had no other employment, and after leaving the military service he became an employé in one of the Departments at Washington. In that employment his conduct has been without reproach, and the official record shows that no one has conducted himself with more propriety, with more industry, with more personal self-respect.

His connections in the State of Missouri are of such character that I may safely say that his name, his family, the prestige that comes from birth and association and education, indicate that if guilty of this offense—I say if guilty, because the evidence is not at all conclusive—it was an indiscretion and not a habit.

Under the circumstances, the refusal of Congress to permit the Executive upon the recommendation of the court-martial to remove this stain from the life of a young man who was a gallant soldier, and who has been an exemplary citizen since he lost his rank in the Army, would be extreme cruelty, and that too after Congress has in so many cases, not half as strong, not one-fourth as strong, by a unanimous vote, restored gentlemen to their rank in the service when the proof was clear and conclusive against them.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] to the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL. This bill is carefully guarded as amended by the committee. It does not place Lieutenant Wells back in the place he would have occupied, but it puts him in the same relative grade that he did occupy at the time he was dismissed. The unanimous recommendation of the court-martial, had it been known to the President, would have received his favorable sanction, and the sentence would not have been approved. There is conclusive evidence of that.

Mr. TELLER. Does it put him back where he was, in the same grade?

Mr. COCKRELL. It puts him back in the same relative grade; that is, he does not go back at the foot of the second lieutenants in

the Army, but he will occupy the relative grade that he occupied in 1877.

Mr. TELLER. He will be just as well off, then, as if he had remained in the Army?

Mr. COCKRELL. No; he might have been a captain by this time or a first lieutenant. He gets no increased grade by reason of being out of the Army. That is the point. His relative grade is not increased one particle by this bill.

Mr. TELLER. What is the objection to the amendment, then?

Mr. COCKRELL. The objection is just this: if this amendment prevails, he is made the junior of all the second lieutenants; if the amendment does not prevail, he occupies under this new appointment the same relative grade among second lieutenants that he did occupy in October, 1877. That is the only difference.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know anything about this case. I only know that this is the worst body in the world to present a case of this kind to. We have no means of knowing anything about the facts except as we get them from the committee, and the committee gets the facts from the friends of the applicant, and in nine cases out of ten it is an *ex parte* statement entirely, prejudiced in favor of the party who desires to be restored. Some time ago, during this session, we passed a bill to restore a man to the Army who had been dismissed for drunkenness. We were told that he had reformed. Before the bill reached the other House he was reeling in the streets here drunk, notoriously so, and I believe the Senate reconsidered the matter. It was not this man, I admit.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. TELLER. I yield.

Mr. VEST. I presume that the Senator from Colorado refers to the case of Colonel Kirby when he makes the statement that a bill passed here for his relief and he was immediately found drunk. I deny that statement. I have the proof to show that the statement is not true, if there is any credit in human testimony. I have in my hand, received this morning, affidavits in relation to that charge—

Mr. TELLER. I did not give way for the Senator to make a speech. Let him make his speech when I get through.

Mr. VEST. I deny the statement.

Mr. TELLER. I have not referred to Colonel Kirby. I did not refer to any one by name. A bill passed here to restore an officer, and I was told by the gentleman who was his attorney that he threw up the case because his client was drunk in the street. I was told that by other people. I do not wish to call this man's name or any other one's name; but the fact that this is an incompetent body to pass upon such questions cannot be denied. There is no method of arriving at the truth about a case of the kind in such a way as ought to satisfy any one.

I think, as was said by the Senator from Kansas, [Mr. INGALLS;] the whole system is wrong. While occasionally we may and undoubtedly shall do a great hardship to some man who may have been overtaken and not be an habitual drunkard, I think the War Department will rarely proceed against a man who is not at least a confirmed drunkard.

Mr. CONGER. Mr. President, I understand from the remarks of one of the Senators that if this bill passes with the amendment which is proposed as a substitute, this officer will be placed in the same position as to numbers above and below other second lieutenants as he held when he was dismissed from the service. I cannot vote for a bill which will restore this officer to the same number which he held then. If he had held his position, in the natural course of events he would have been promoted and would now be out of the way of the second lieutenants, and out of the way of interfering with their promotion. I cannot see why by any arbitrary rule this man should be set down in a particular number, simply because he had it when he was discharged from the Army, over those who have the right to expect their own promotion, and their own advancement in the regular order of service; and I cannot vote for the bill as far as I am acquainted with the subject now.

If this bill can be so amended that this man may be made a second lieutenant as of to-day, coming in after those who would precede him, I have no objection to that; but I think the precedent set by the bill as it stands will be wrong. It would be very unjust to innocent, honorable men who have gained their positions for Congress to legislate them out of their positions in favor of a man who was discharged for drunkenness. In my judgment Congress go far enough if they overlook the fault and allow him to return to the Army again at all. There are men, as I am told, second lieutenants, who have been long in the service, waiting for promotion and their chance for promotion, and they have the right to it under the laws of the United States. With the amendment giving him the number he held (which is a mere arbitrary rule, an accidental rule) when he was discharged from the Army for drunkenness, I cannot approve or vote for the bill.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, I know little about this case, and I am quite sure I should have said nothing about it but for the extraordinary view of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] upon the capacity of this body to transact business of this kind. I had thought this body was quite capable of investigating matters through its committees, and I cannot account for the distrust of it expressed

by the Senator from Colorado, except upon the ground that he expects soon to cease to be one of us, and he does not want to bear with our mode of doing business much longer. I do not think with the Senator from Colorado that a person seeking to be relieved gets such a sort of hearing as he seems to suppose. I have looked at the report in this case. It was made by the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. COCKRELL,] and I have been taught to believe that he was rather careful in reporting bills of this kind, but according to the Senator from Colorado my friend from Missouri must be losing his usual vigilance on these questions. I have been in the habit of observing the action of some three or four members of this body since I have been here, and when they report in favor of relieving anybody I am ready to vote for it, and I have the utmost respect for my friend from Missouri, and he is the very head of the list whom I implicitly follow. I think I can assure him that the Senate, despite the warnings raised by the Senator from Colorado, may safely vote for this bill as it came from the committee.

Something has to be trusted, and a great deal more than something, nearly everything almost has to be trusted here to the vigilance, labor, and care of committees, or we shall do nothing at all. I have found that the real difficulty in getting through a committee—by a person applying for relief—has been, not that he gets a one-sided hearing in his favor, but first as to whether he gets a hearing at all, because it is the inclination of men's minds, especially men when they get to be of sufficient age to be Senators, to leave done those things which have been accomplished. If I were to approach the presiding officer of this body in a judicial capacity, one of the first impulses of his mind would be to find whether the thing had been decided once against me, and if it had it would be *res adjudicata* square in my face. It is so with every committee of this body. We go there; we may have some unfortunate client that has stumbled some time or other in the great journey of life and who wants to get up again, and he is met right at the committee door, even before he gets in, with the decision of the Department, the ruling of the Secretary. It is all against him. Here is the record, he is told. He commences at the very foot of the hill, climbs slowly, removing little by little the obstacles that are in his way every inch of the ground; and instead of the committees giving too much relief of this kind they do not give enough. They slam the door in the face of many a person worthy of relief on the ground that the case has been adjudicated against him, and it is best not to reopen it, as reopening it would involve a great deal of labor, and all that.

I do not know whether this bill restores this man to the exact rank he would have had if he had not met this misfortune, nor do I care. I will do him the justice of restoring him; but on that question I think we can trust the committee; I think we can trust the Senator from Missouri and the Committee on Military Affairs; and with all due respect for amendments offered to bills here in the Senate, it has to be shown that some obvious injustice is being done by the bill or that some fact or circumstance has been overlooked by the committee which ought to be corrected here in this body, or I will give the committee my approval rather than those who here, without investigating the case, propose to amend the result of their investigations. I shall vote for the bill as it came from the committee, regretting extremely that the Senator from Colorado called me from my usual quietude during the morning hour to respond to criticisms which he is giving us in perhaps the last period of his service in this body.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] to the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected, there being on a division—ayes 19, noes 26.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs as a substitute for the original bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and read the third time.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the roll was called.

Mr. GARLAND, (when his name was called.) I am paired with the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. EDMUNDS.] If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CONGER, (when Mr. FERRY's name was called.) My colleague [Mr. FERRY] is paired with the Senator from Delaware, [Mr. SAULSBURY.]

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 35, nays 21; as follows:

## YEAS—35.

|                 |                  |           |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------|
| Bayard,         | Davis of W. Va., | Sewell,   |
| Beck,           | Fair,            | Slater,   |
| Brown,          | Farley,          | Vance,    |
| Butler,         | Hampton,         | Vest,     |
| Call,           | Harris,          | Voorhees, |
| Camden,         | Harrison,        | Walker,   |
| Cameron of Pa., | Hawley,          | Williams, |
| Cockrell,       | Jackson,         | Windom,   |
| Coke,           | Johnston,        | Ransom,   |

## NAYS—21.

|                    |                   |           |          |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|
| Aldrich,           | Dawes,            | Mitchell, | Sawyer,  |
| Anthony,           | Frye,             | Morrill,  | Sherman, |
| Blair,             | Hill of Colorado, | Platt,    | Teller.  |
| Cameron of Wis.,   | Hoar,             | Plumb,    |          |
| Conger,            | Ingalls,          | Rollins,  |          |
| Davis of Illinois, | Miller of N. Y.,  | Saunders, |          |

## ABSENT—20.

|          |                  |          |            |
|----------|------------------|----------|------------|
| Allison, | Gorman,          | Kellogg, | McMillan,  |
| Edmunds, | Groome,          | Lamar,   | McPherson, |
| Ferry,   | Grover,          | Lapham,  | Mahone,    |
| Garland, | Hale,            | Logan,   | Saulsbury, |
| George,  | Hill of Georgia, | McDill,  | Van Wyck.  |

So the bill was passed.

EUGENE B. ALLEN.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yesterday Order of Business No. 178, the bill (S. No. 1120) for the relief of Eugene B. Allen, was passed by informally without prejudice, not to lose its place on the Calendar, at my instance. I hope now that it will be taken up.

The bill (S. No. 1120) for the relief of Eugene B. Allen was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, [Mr. INGALLS,] which will be reported.

The ACTING SECRETARY. The proposed amendment is to strike out from line 6 to line 10 inclusive, as follows:

Whatever sum of money, not exceeding the sum of \$37,306.80, shall appear to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, upon examination and proofs to be presented by said Allen, to be justly due him as indemnity.

And to insert in lieu thereof "the sum of \$25,753.94."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

Mr. INGALLS. In line 14 the word "Hoyt" should be "Hayt." The error is a mere clerical one. The name of the commissioner referred to is "Hayt."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The correction will be made.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS J. MILLER.

Mr. HOAR. Let Senate bill No. 49, which was passed over yesterday without prejudice, be now taken up.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. No. 49) for the relief of Thomas J. Miller, of Washington Territory.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## MILITARY EXPENSES OF KANSAS.

The bill (S. No. 87) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain and report to Congress the amount of money expended and indebtedness assumed by the State of Kansas in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, with the aid and assistance of the Secretary of War, to cause to be examined and investigated all the claims of the State of Kansas against the United States of America for moneys alleged to have been expended and for indebtedness alleged to have been assumed by said State in organizing, arming, equipping, subsisting, transporting, and paying the volunteer and military forces of said State called into active service by the governor of said State between the 15th day of April, in the year 1861, and the date of this act, to repel Indian invasions and to suppress Indian hostilities in said State and upon its borders, including all proper expenses necessarily incurred by said State on account of said forces having been so called into active service as aforesaid; and also all proper claims paid or assumed by said State for horses and equipments actually lost by said forces while in the line of duty in active service.

SEC. 2. That no higher rate shall be allowed for the services of said forces, and for supplies, transportation, and other proper expenses, than was allowed and paid by the United States for similar services in the same grade and for the same time in the United States Army serving in said State, and for similar supplies, transportation, and other proper expenses during the same time furnished the United States Army in the same country; and no allowance shall be made for services of such forces except for the time during which they were engaged in active service in the field; and no allowance shall be made for the services of any person in more than one capacity at the same time, or for any expenditures for which the Secretary of War shall decide there was no necessity at the time and under all the circumstances.

SEC. 3. That to enable the said officers to make the examination and investigation herein authorized the governor of the State of Kansas or his duly authorized agent shall file with the Secretary of the Treasury abstracts and statements of all such claims by said State, showing the amounts of such expenditures and indebtedness and the purposes for which they were made, and accompanied with proper vouchers and evidence.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, at the earliest practicable time, report to Congress for final action the results of such examination and investigation, and the amount or amounts found to have been properly expended for the purposes aforesaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

Mr. ALLISON. Does the bill contain any appropriation?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all. It simply allows the Secretary of the Treasury to examine and report to Congress.



Mr. ALLISON. How can the Secretary make an examination without a force to do it? What is the method to be adopted?

Mr. COCKRELL. The same kind of method he has been using since 1863-'64, the same machinery that he has used in his office for the examination of all the claims of the States.

Mr. ALLISON. Are these claims on file in the Treasury?

Mr. COCKRELL. Some of them are, and some are to be filed.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to examine and report to Congress the amount of all claims of the State of Kansas for money expended and indebtedness assumed by said State in repelling Indian invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities."

#### COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask that the bill (S. No. 724) to fix the term of office of collectors of internal revenue may be considered at the next session of the Senate without prejudice. It was passed over some weeks ago on account of the absence of a Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it likely to take time?

Mr. MORRILL. I think not. I merely ask that it be placed on the Calendar so as to be considered without prejudice at the next session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is on the Calendar passed over without prejudice, and will be taken up to-morrow unless there is a bill pending at that time.

#### BREVET MAJOR-GENERAL MEIGS.

The bill (S. No. 1117) for the retirement of Brevet Major-General Meigs with the rank and pay of a retired officer of the grade of major-general was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HAWLEY. The bill was reported by direction of the Military Committee before General Meigs was retired. Just after that a message came in from the President retiring him. Therefore it is necessary to change the wording of the bill. I move to substitute the following, which is the same in substance but in different language:

Whereas the President did, by virtue of the discretionary power vested in him by section 1204 of the Revised Statutes, retire Brigadier and Brevet Major General Montgomery C. Meigs, Quartermaster-General of the United States Army, from active service, to take effect on the 8th day of February, 1882; and

Whereas at the date of his being retired the said Montgomery C. Meigs had served his country faithfully for over forty-nine and one-half years, and, having been appointed Quartermaster-General in 1861, twenty years ago, had, by advice and consent of the Senate, been brevetted to the rank of major-general on July 5, 1864, and had served under assignment to duty according to his rank of major-general by brevet for over seventeen years:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to place Brigadier and Brevet Major General Montgomery C. Meigs on the retired list of major-generals according to his brevet rank, with the pay and emoluments of a major-general on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HAWLEY. I move to amend the title to read:

A bill authorizing the President to place Brigadier and Brevet Major General Montgomery C. Meigs on the retired list with the pay and emoluments of a major-general on the retired list.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is a preamble to the bill.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### TOWN OF PERU, IOWA.

The bill (S. No. 916) to provide for the appraisal and sale of lots in the town of Peru, Dubuque County, Iowa, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

Mr. ALLISON. I think I can explain this bill in a few moments, and thus avoid the necessity of reading the report.

Mr. COCKRELL. Very well.

Mr. ALLISON. There were laid out in 1836 four or five towns in the State of Iowa, this town of Peru being one of them, and embracing six hundred and forty acres of land. The town has been wholly abandoned. There were in 1837, I believe, some one hundred lots sold. The owners of those lots have passed away apparently; at least they make no claim to them, and for the last twenty years this land has been settled upon by agriculturists. There is no town there. The object of this bill is to have the land appraised and sold to the highest bidder; giving, however, these agriculturists an opportunity of taking the land at the appraised value. That is all there is in the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. This bill provides for three commissioners at \$5 a day each, to view and appraise town lots that probably do not exist, the town having been utterly abandoned and the town lots being under cultivation. I do not see any necessity for any such expense being incurred by the Government of the United States when nobody wants the lots and there are no improvements upon them.

Mr. ALLISON. At first view I quite agree with the Senator from Missouri, and I introduced a bill substantially providing for the sale of these farm lands; but on submitting it to the General Land Office they insisted that those persons who had purchased lots should in some way be protected if any record appeared with reference to their

purchases, and thereupon I consented to the machinery as proposed in this bill, authorizing the appraisal of town lots if there are any there. The town has been regularly laid out, and the plat of it is in the Land Office, and I think there will be no trouble about it. I will say to my friend from Missouri that I do not think this appraisal will occupy more than two or three days of time, so I apprehend no great cost will result.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have no doubt but what there ought to be a vesting of the Government title in the present owners of the land in some way; but that there is any necessity for agricultural lands to be appraised as town lots, and have commissioners to appraise them, I cannot see.

Mr. INGALLS. I wish the Senator from Iowa would inform me what title the Government has in these lands. If I understand the operation of the town-site act, whenever the town was laid out the conveyance was made by patent to the probate judge of the county, and to certain other officers named, and the title of the Government was absolutely divested. Therefore, if subsequently the town was abandoned, the right to take subsequent proceeding vested in the State laws. In my opinion the Government has no more to do with the disposition of these town lots in Iowa than it has to do with the sale of property in another jurisdiction.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be very glad to know that the law is as stated by the Senator from Kansas. I shall turn to the statutes in a moment. Commissioners were appointed to sell the land in these various towns in Iowa. The title has always remained in the United States Government and is in the United States Government to-day; so that there is no way of making disposition of this property other than the way proposed in the bill, unless we donate it to the settlers who are upon the land now. If the Senator will turn to the statute of 1836, laying out the towns, he will see that commissioners were appointed to appraise and sell the lots.

Mr. PLUMB. This town was laid out under an old law not now applicable to the public domain, and the Government proceeded to sell, as it does not now do, the lots according to the survey. It sold about sixty lots of the total number embraced within this town plat. After a time the town site was practically abandoned for town purposes, but still the record remains of the subdivision of this tract into town lots, and these people still hold upon this tract these subdivisions, which they purchased with reference to that plat.

It was not possible, therefore, to sell the land according to the legal subdivisions, because to do so would have embraced one or more of these lots so sold. Consequently it had to be sold excepting these lots, or it had to be sold according to the plat and survey as made for town purposes. In the embarrassment which surrounded the consideration of this question, the Committee on Public Lands, being advised by the General Land Office, concluded that the best way was to have an appraisal and a sale under the authority of commissioners, in order that the Government might not only derive proper advantage from all the existing circumstances which may have given increased value to this land, but at the same time the purchasers of these lots from the Government heretofore in these small subdivisions may be fully protected.

The law under which this tract was originally laid out is not the law of 1841, which my colleague quoted, and which provides now, as the law did not at the time of this survey, for the entry of not more than half a section of land by a town company practically, to be patented to the county judge of the county for the benefit of the occupants.

I think the bill has been sufficiently considered, and embraces substantially the only practical solution of the difficulty by which we are confronted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is an amendment reported by the Committee on Public Lands, which will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. In line 12, after the word "months," it is moved to insert:

Reserving from such sale such lots as, according to the records of the General Land Office, have already been paid for or patented.

So as to make the clause read:

Said commissioners shall have power, and it is hereby made their duty, to view said lots and appraise their value, not taking into consideration the improvements thereon, after which appraisal the proper register and receiver shall expose said lots to public sale to the highest bidder, after advertising the same in three public newspapers at least three months, reserving from such sale such lots as, according to the records of the General Land Office, have already been paid for or patented.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the preamble.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### JOHN J. SALTER.

The bill (S. No. 322) for the relief of John J. Salter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to revoke so much of War Department Special Order No. 216, of date June 22, 1864, as relates to and directs the dismis-

sal from the Army, with loss of all pay and allowances, of First Lieutenant John J. Salter, of Company K, Eighth Regiment Minnesota Volunteers, and to grant to him an honorable discharge as of that date, and that the records of said company be amended accordingly: *Provided*, That said Salter shall receive no pay or allowances after the date of said order of dismissal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John I. Salter."

H. V. PHILPOTT.

The bill (H. R. No. 1671) for the relief of H. V. Philpott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment to H. V. Philpott, of Texas, of \$500, in full for services rendered by him by order of Hon. John C. Watrous, judge of the United States district court for the eastern district of Texas, in assorting, arranging, and labeling certain papers and records in the office of the clerk of that court at Galveston.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM D. WHITING.

The next bill, (H. R. No. 697,) for the relief of Captain William D. Whiting, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that Captain William D. Whiting, United States Navy, having been promoted for faithful and efficient war service, and having served in the Navy faithfully for forty years and upward, and having been appointed chief of the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department with the relative rank of commodore, and holding that position on the date of his retirement in pursuance of law on account of physical incapacity, such incapacity having been contracted on duty or being incident thereto, his name shall be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank and retired pay of a commodore as though he had been promoted to that grade prior to his retirement.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there any report with that bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is a House report.

Mr. TELLER. Let that be read.

The Acting Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs in the House of Representatives, January 17, 1882:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 697) for the relief of Captain William D. Whiting, United States Navy, beg leave to report the same back with a recommendation that it do pass.

Captain William D. Whiting has one of the best and most honorable records of any officer in the Navy. For his fidelity and efficiency in the service, as well as his intelligence, he was appointed by the President as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. Holding such position, he was under the law entitled to the rank of commodore, while his real rank was that of captain. While in the line of his duty as commodore he became afflicted with the loss of his eye-sight. The original cause of this antedates his service as chief of the bureau, and originated in the line of duty, but yet this incapacity was not so severe as to become very serious until after his promotion. Your committee, in view of his honorable record, the fact that he held the rank of commodore while chief of the bureau, and the facts attending his loss of eye-sight, deem it an act of justice to him that he shall be retired upon the rank and pay of a commodore. Possibly just such a combination of facts can never occur again.

Mr. FARLEY. This bill was reported by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He is not present, but the report is unanimous, and the question was very thoroughly considered in the committee. We adopt the House report. The Senator from New Jersey is not here to-day, but the report is very full, and the bill was considered very carefully in the committee, and they are unanimously in favor of the measure.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M. DORSEY AND WILLIAM F. SHEPARD.

The bill (S. No. 214) for the relief of John M. Dorsey and William F. Shepard, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment of \$9,021.33 to John M. Dorsey, and of \$3,746.66 to William F. Shepard, in full settlement for beef and supplies furnished certain volunteer troops by Dorsey, Shepard, and one S. B. Wallace while those troops were engaged in quelling the Indian disturbances in the Territory of Utah, now the State of Nevada, in the year 1860.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there a report in that case?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Yes, sir; a long report.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. The Senator is familiar with the case.

Mr. COCKRELL. I remember the case now. I was engaged in conversation when the name of the bill was announced.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EARL S. RATHBUN.

The bill (S. No. 891) granting a pension to Earl S. Rathbun, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, after the word "month," in line 7, to strike out "and to begin at the date of the honorable discharge of said Rathbun from the military service" and insert "from and after the date of the

passage of this act, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Earl S. Rathbun, said pension to be at the rate of \$8 per month, and to begin at the date of the honorable discharge of said Rathbun from the military service from and after the date of the passage of this act, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. S. A. WRIGHT AND MRS. C. FAHNESTOCK.

The next bill on the Calendar was the bill (S. No. 272) for the relief of Mrs. S. A. Wright and Mrs. C. Fahnestock.

Mr. PLATT. That bill was reported by the Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. WILLIAMS,] who has been called from the Senate on account of indisposition, and he requested me to ask that it be passed by without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That will be so done if there be no objection.

ADVANCES BY GEORGIA.

The next bill on the Calendar was the bill (S. No. 270) to repay the State of Georgia \$27,175.50, money advanced by said State for the defense of her frontiers against the Indians from 1795 to 1818, and not heretofore paid.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to audit the claims of the State of Georgia for moneys advanced by said State to pay troops ordered into service for the defense of her frontiers against the Indians, from 1795 to 1818, inclusive, and not heretofore repaid to said State, and to pay to said State such sum, not exceeding \$22,567.42, as he shall find due and unpaid, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That if there be any sums of money due or owing to the United States by the State of Georgia, whatever amount, if any, may be found due under the provisions of this act to the State of Georgia shall be credited to that State, and the balance only shall be paid by the State of Georgia or the United States, as shall appear by the striking of a balance to be due from the one party or the other.

Mr. MORRILL. I think that is so old a claim for advances made from 1795 to 1818, that it ought to have a full explanation. I do not see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] present who reported the bill.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. There is a brief report which I think sets forth very clearly the nature of the claim.

Mr. MORRILL. I think the bill had better go over until the Senator from Massachusetts is present.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope, as the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Georgia are both absent, the Senator from Vermont will allow the bill to go over without prejudice.

Mr. MORRILL. Oh, yes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

LIQUOR PROHIBITION.

The next business on the Calendar was the joint resolution (S. R. No. 32) proposing an amendment to the Constitution in relation to alcoholic liquors and other poisonous beverages.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This was introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. BLAIR,] who doubtless desires to submit some remarks, as it has only been read the first time. It will be passed over.

JONATHAN R. SPENCER.

The next bill on the Calendar was the bill (S. No. 887) granting a pension to Jonathan R. Spencer.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that be passed over until I can hear more from the Department.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over.

FORT LEAVENWORTH MILITARY RESERVATION.

The bill (S. No. 406) to provide for the sale of certain portions of the Fort Leavenworth military reservation was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to amend by adding another section to the bill. I think the Senator who reported the bill [Mr. MAXEY] will agree with me that this is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the spirit of the bill:

SEC. 4. That if any railway company, other than the said Kansas Central Railway Company, now occupying said right of way, or being in process of construction to or upon the same at the date of the appraisement hereinbefore provided for, shall desire to purchase and occupy any portion of the land, the sale of which is herein provided for, such company or companies shall have the right to purchase a pro rata proportion of the whole of such tract herein authorized to be sold, upon the same terms and conditions hereinbefore prescribed for the said Kansas Central Railway Company in accordance with the third section of the act of July 20, 1868, and patents shall be made accordingly.

Mr. MAXEY. The bill under consideration was reported by myself, and in my report on behalf of the committee, I incorporated section 3 of the act of July 20, 1868, and I ask that that be read to explain the rights which the railroad companies have.

The Acting Secretary read as follows:

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That for the use of railroads leading to said bridge from either side of the river there is hereby granted a right of way through



said Fort Leavenworth military reservation not exceeding for all of said roads three hundred feet in width: *Provided*, That said roads do not in any way interfere with the public buildings on said military reservation.

Mr. MAXEY. I will say that I have no objection to the amendment. The purpose of the committee was to carry out the provisions of section 3 of the act of 1863, and to make grants to various railroad companies as provided by that section; and the third section of this bill as reported by the committee in its conclusion says:

And the same rights shall belong to and be enjoyed by all other railroad companies entitled to accept said right of way under the said third section of the act of July 20, 1863.

Therefore, as the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas simply carries out that section 3, and asks no more or other rights than were granted by that act, of course I make no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ADVANCES BY GEORGIA.

Mr. BROWN. I introduced a bill here at an early period of the session to pay to the State of Georgia a certain amount of money that she had expended in the Indian wars at an early period of the Government. It was reported on by the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. HOAR,] a member of the Committee on Claims. A while ago, while we were both out, I understand it was called up and passed over, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. CAMERON] is kind enough to tell me, without prejudice. I think it will take but a few minutes, and I shall be glad to go back to it now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That will be done.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. No. 270) to repay the State of Georgia \$27,175.50, money advanced by said State for the defense of her frontiers against the Indians, from 1795 to 1813, and not heretofore repaid.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Claims, which has been read.

Mr. HOAR. I will make a very brief statement. This is a very old State claim, but the committee unanimously reported the bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay what he shall find due on, finding also the facts which are required to be proved. It is a claim for advances by the State in Indian wars soon after the formation of the Federal Constitution. Other States were paid for similar expenditures, but the vouchers of this State were lost and the State never was able to prove the facts which were necessary for the allowance of the claim. Those vouchers were discovered by the honorable Senator from Georgia, [Mr. BROWN,] when he was governor of the State, in a crypt at the state-house. That I think was during the war or about the time of the war; and after their discovery they were presented.

The bill is very carefully guarded to place upon the Secretary of the Treasury the responsibility of re-examining these facts which have been proved to the satisfaction of the committee, and we think it is a very clear and plain case.

Mr. BROWN. Our State-house at Milledgeville was not a very large one. There were some basement rooms in the State-house that were used as a place of deposit of such early documents as it was thought would not be of much use in future. They had been unfortunately neglected there by former governors of the State. When I came into the executive office, in looking through those basement rooms I found a large file of old documents of that character, some of which were nearly rotten, many of them were lost, a few of them probably of much importance. In having the whole thing overhauled, however, among other papers in the cellar were found these vouchers that the State had never before been able to find, showing that we had paid out this money in aid of the United States Government in the Indian wars. They were sent on, and it was found that everything corresponded except a small item, I believe of three or four thousand dollars, for which vouchers were not found, and that was deducted. We do not claim it, because we cannot prove it. That is the history of the loss.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Claims as a substitute for the original bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the repayment to the State of Georgia of \$22,567.42, money advanced by said State for the defense of her frontiers against the Indians."

#### ROBERT J. BAUGNESS.

The bill (S. No. 404) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Robert J. Baugness, deceased, was announced as the next in order.

Mr. PLUMB. That bill has been reported adversely from the Committee on Pensions. I have some testimony which was not before the Committee, but it is not now in hand, which I shall have

here in the morning, on which I think I shall be able to convince the Senate that the bill ought to pass, the report of the committee to the contrary notwithstanding. I therefore ask that it may be passed over informally to retain its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection that will be ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. Was that evidence submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. PLUMB. It was not. It was only recently received by me.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not recommit the bill?

Mr. PLUMB. I will take the chance of convincing the Senate as to the propriety of passing the bill, and if they think it ought to be recommitted, very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

#### SMITH E. G. RAWSON.

The next bill on the Calendar was the bill (S. No. 203) for the relief of the widow and children of Smith E. G. Rawson.

Mr. PLATT. I understand that a House bill similar to the Senate bill has been passed, but there is some delay, and I have not been able to get the House bill. I ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be passed over without prejudice.

#### LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

The next bill on the Calendar was the bill (S. No. 1) to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service, and to encourage the saving of life from shipwreck.

Mr. CONGER. Let that be passed over without prejudice. The Senate has acted on the House bill. Let this remain on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

#### CYRUS C. CLARK.

The bill (H. R. No. 89) for the relief of Cyrus C. Clark was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow to Cyrus C. Clark, late an additional paymaster in the Army, in the settlement of his account, a credit for \$15,979.87, as of the date of April 6, 1865, the same being for money lost by him in the discharge of his official duty, without fault or neglect on his part, as decided heretofore by the Court of Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

Mr. HAWLEY. I make the suggestion to the Senator from Missouri, as he himself must observe the shortness of time, that the reading of the report will take just about the five minutes that remain. He is familiar with every line of it, having heard it read and commented upon, and having agreed to it. I do not wish the Senate to pass the bill, because I shall defend it, without question; but if the Senate will omit the reading I will make a brief statement which I think will supply the place.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have something that will show why we ought to pass a bill of this kind. There should be something on the record. I have no objection to hearing the statement in lieu of having the report read.

Mr. HAWLEY. This officer, as is shown by citizens and brother officers, was an effective man in his place, a man of excellent character, and was exercising, as the court of inquiry shows, a fair discretion and judgment in the care of his property. He had a pretty large sum of money on hand for the payment of troops, some thirty-one thousand dollars. He had looked over it, and he knew just how much he had in his safe. He had people whom he thought he could trust in his quarters. He went away for an hour or two on business, and came back and found that the safe had been broken up and this amount of money carried off. He went directly to the commanding officer and demanded a court of inquiry. The court sat some days, but was unable to fix exactly the amount. The testimony, which I have here in pamphlet in full, shows that the two persons who were implicated as possibly guilty were afterwards tried, convicted, and they were sentenced to a long and severe sentence. Further, the commission reported that the officer was not to blame, and exonerated him; and that is the opinion of the paymaster of the district, who gave him a full vindication.

Not to dwell too long upon the matter, for I shall be reading the report if I continue, the case went to the Court of Claims; it went up from the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court, and went back to the Court of Claims, and then came up on another appeal. The opinion of the Supreme Court was, on the whole, in all respects favorable. I will read just a paragraph from the report:

This led the appellate court to a second reversal of the judgment, and remanding of the case for further proceedings, in doing which, however, that tribunal declared its opinion that as to the amount lost, the fact of loss being first proved by other competent evidence, the petitioner was a competent witness—that is, Clark—as at common law, under which, in certain circumstances held parallel to those of the present case, a loser, although a party in interest, might testify to the contents of a lost package. This last decision was rendered February 25, 1878.

Then the case came down to the point how the exact amount of loss should be proved; and it was objected by counsel for the Government that Clark himself could not establish it. The Supreme Court said that there being other evidence as a basis Clark might then be allowed to talk about it. Then the case seemed open to final

and complete settlement; but in the mean time Clark had disappeared wholly. He got into some little scandal, and like a foolish man ran away. In my opinion he would have got through well enough had he staid. He ran away and left his bondsmen with this bond upon their shoulders. But the evidence in the Court of Claims, before the commission of inquiry, and in the Department, shows beyond question the amount that was lost. All that remained of the case was a purely technical point as to proving the exact figures. There was no doubt about what it amounted to.

This case has had the deliberate and careful consideration of two of the ablest lawyers in the House of Representatives, men of high judicial character and ability. It has had three favorable reports from them; and being sent to me in the Committee on Military Affairs I could not do anything else in the world but accept the report of one of these gentlemen, and it is this report, No. 153, literally made by one of these gentlemen, which was adopted by the Senate committee. I think there can be no question that every possible safeguard has been observed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. R. No. 182) to print 90,000 copies of the statistics of the population of the United States, &c.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had appointed Mr. W. D. WASHBURN, of Minnesota, a conferee on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. No. 308) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the most accessible point within five miles above the city of Saint Charles, Missouri, in place of Mr. PAGE, excused.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the reports prepared under the direction of the United States Fish Commission for the census of 1880.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. No. 1361) to provide additional accommodations for the Department of the Interior, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. No. 42) for the relief of George G. Snyder; and

A bill (S. No. 383) to amend section 4458 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to license fees of officers of steam-vessels.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (S. No. 90) to pay the creditors of the late Henry O. Waggoner, late consular clerk at Lyons, France; and

A bill (S. No. 864) to confirm certain instructions given by the Department of the Interior to the Indian agent at Green Bay agency, in the State of Wisconsin, and to legalize the acts done and permitted by said Indian agent pursuant thereto.

#### PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The hour of two o'clock has arrived, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. No. 613) to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decision of questions arising thereon.

Mr. DAWES. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside in order to proceed with the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, that course will be pursued.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. R. No. 182) to print 90,000 copies of the statistics of the population of the United States, &c., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

#### FISH COMMISSION REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring.)* That of the reports prepared under the direction of the United States Fish Commission for the census of 1880, 1,500 additional copies be printed from the stereotype plates for the use of and distribution by the Fish Commission.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 28th instant, and the accompanying letter of the Superintendent of the Gov-

ernment Hospital for the Insane, submitting an estimate for a deficiency appropriation of \$20,792.51 for the support of that institution for the remaining portion of the present fiscal year.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 30, 1882.

He also laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, inclosing draft of a bill to amend section 2056 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the term of office of Indian inspectors and Indian agents. The subject is commended to the consideration of Congress.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 30, 1882.

He also laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 29th of March, and the accompanying letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, submitting an estimate for additions of \$34,200 and of \$20,000, respectively, to the appropriations for salaries, fees, and commissions of registers and receivers, and for contingent expenses, land offices, for the next fiscal year.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 30, 1882.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a resolution calling for the amount of supplies, tents, and transportation furnished by the Department to the several States for the relief of the sufferers by the overflow of the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. VANCE. House bill No. 2938, for the relief of Thomas Evans, was referred to the Committee on Finance. It should have been referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The change of reference will be made.

#### INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 4185) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] very kindly said yesterday that he would consent to an amendment which I have offered to the Indian appropriation bill being considered before his. I expect to leave the city, and it will not take, I think, a very great while to dispose of the amendment, while I understand that his amendment will probably lead to a good deal of discussion.

Mr. DAWES. I should think it would be as well to go on with the pending amendment of my colleague.

Mr. CALL. I expect to leave the city for a short time.

Mr. DAWES. Under those circumstances I withdraw my suggestion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] will be laid aside temporarily, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] proposes an amendment, which will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. After line 652, it is proposed to insert:

That the amount of money named in the treaty between the United States and the Seminole and Creek Indians of Florida to be paid to the part of the Seminole tribe remaining in Florida, is hereby appropriated for the support of that part of the tribe now residing in Florida, and for the support of common schools and the encouragement of the said Indians in agriculture; and the sum shall be paid out per capita for them, giving that portion of the Seminoles now remaining in Florida their proportion per capita of the said amount, and such of the Seminoles as have removed from Florida since the said treaty their proportion of the said sum of money.

Mr. DAWES. Is that amendment in print?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is partly in print, and partly in manuscript.

Mr. CALL. I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the addition to the amendment is only explanatory, in order to make the language more definite.

If the Senator from Massachusetts will give me his ear for a moment I will explain the amendment. In 1839, and again in 1856, the United States made a treaty with the Creek and Seminole nations.

Mr. PLUMB. Before the Senator proceeds I want to say on behalf of the committee that I wish to reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CALL. Then it is unnecessary for me to say anything.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not mean to say that the point of order will be raised; only that it may be raised.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Massachusetts in charge of the bill agreed with me that it would not be raised.

Mr. PLUMB. So far as I am concerned, having had something to do with the preparation of the bill, this opening up the general question of amendment and so on, I desire to reserve the point of order. I may not raise it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The point of order will be reserved.

Mr. CALL. I will state the case, and then the Senator can raise the point of order if he wishes. The amendment is a very meritorious



rious one. It is one that no Senator can raise any kind of objection to in reason. In 1856 the United States made a treaty with the united Creek and Seminole nations, which will be found in the collection of treaties published by authority of Congress. By that treaty the Government agreed to appropriate the sum of \$250,000, the interest on which was to be paid to the remainder of the Seminole Indians then remaining in Florida, when they should emigrate and join their brethren in the West. Those Indians have never emigrated; they are now in Florida; they are becoming good citizens; they are peaceable people, and the people of Florida are content for them to remain there. The consideration which the United States agreed to receive for that appropriation of money has been paid.

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator be kind enough, while he is speaking, to give me the date of the treaty?

Mr. CALL. I will give the date of the treaty and read a passage from it. The treaty was made August 28, 1856, and is found on page 110 of the Revision of Indian Treaties. The language of the treaty, which I wish to read, is as follows:

The further sum of \$250,000 shall be invested in like manner whenever the Seminoles now remaining in Florida shall have emigrated and joined their brethren in the West; whereupon the two sums so invested shall constitute a fund belonging to the united tribe of Seminoles, and the interest on which, at the rate aforesaid, shall be annually paid over to them per capita as annuity.

That remnant of the tribe never migrated to the West, they are in Florida. They are not within the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, as the Secretary of the Interior says they are not the objects of its care. The consideration which was stipulated by the tribe has been paid. The Indian title has been extinguished throughout the whole State of Florida to the public land which had been recognized as theirs, and the cession of which was the consideration on their part in this treaty. They are there without care, without land, without a home, without any assistance on the part of the Government, and their portion of the consideration has been long ago paid and utilized by the Government. The people there are content for them to stay.

These Indians are capable of being civilized, and with the assistance of the money which my amendment would give them, providing for them the same schools that are provided under the treaty for their brethren in the West, giving them some assistance in becoming agriculturists, these peaceable people, who have commended themselves to the good feeling of the people of Florida in the period of time from the treaty until now, ask that the equitable purpose and spirit of this provision be applied to their benefit, and that by the head, per capita, of those now remaining there with those of the tribe who have migrated west since the treaty. It is but a very small proportion, there being very few in numbers in Florida, but I ask that their proportion of the interest upon that sum of money shall be paid to them and for their benefit and not be paid to those in the West to whom it was stipulated it should not be paid. You will perceive the plain language of the treaty is that it is to be paid to the united tribe when those then in Florida shall migrate and join their brethren in the West, which they have never done.

There are from three hundred to six hundred of these Indians now in Florida. The number is not specifically known, notwithstanding the Government has had an agent down there trying to find out. They are in the extreme southern portion of the State of Florida, living in their tribal relations, with their own villages, upon land belonging to individuals, without homes, here and there occupying places which the settlements have not yet reached. It is to the interest of the people of that country that those Seminoles, who cannot be moved out by force, should be provided with some means of subsistence and should be encouraged in agriculture, and should not be left to starve and to depredate upon the cattle and the homes of the people there; that they should be encouraged in the good work which they have of themselves commenced.

The amendment which I have offered to the bill provides that per capita, by the head, of those now remaining there, compared with the number of those who have gone west under the provisions of the treaty, this amount shall be distributed to them under the direction and control of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DAWES. The condition of the Indians in Florida, the remnant of the Seminoles left there who have never gone to the Indian Territory, I have no doubt has been correctly set forth by the Senator from Florida, and it would be very proper to do something for those Indians. One cannot tell exactly how safe it would be to adopt this amendment by simply hearing the treaty read, as the Senator from Florida has read it, without having some examination at the Interior Department of subsequent legislation.

My attention has just been called to a similar case, where a large sum of money was by treaty withheld by the Government from the North Carolina Cherokees, who are in very much the same condition with these Seminoles. Each one of them was to have so much money who would remove to the Indian Territory. Some have removed, and some are still there, in very much the condition of these Indians, and they want to have the money applied to them. I prepared an amendment to meet that case; but upon conference with the Indian Bureau this morning I find that Congress deliberately, by subsequent acts of legislation, in the face of the treaty, has diverted that whole sum to other purposes and so tied it up by statute that it cannot be applied as proposed.

I do not know that Congress has done anything with this treaty stipulation like that, but I do not know that it has not. There has been no report from the Interior Department, no examination by the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Indian Affairs upon this subject, and it is simply upon the statement of the Senator from Florida, which I have no doubt is true, according to his own information, that we are called upon to legislate. If the Senator would make it an appropriation chargeable upon the Treasury, and let the fund be disposed of subsequently, if it is at liberty, to reimburse the Treasury, then we could see the merit of the proposition not complicated by any treaty provision. So far as I am concerned, I should be willing to listen to an amendment of that kind; but representing the Committee on Appropriations here at this time, I am compelled to oppose the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Massachusetts will find that the interest upon \$250,000 is being appropriated annually; the principal fund is still intact, but the interest is being appropriated to the Seminoles in the West, treating the question as if the Indians who have ever been and are still in Florida had migrated west in conformity with the terms of the treaty. The fund exists and the appropriation of the interest is being made every year to those in the West in direct violation of the terms of the treaty.

Mr. DAWES. Very likely; that may be so; but the record of the treatment of the Government toward the Seminoles, the Senator from Florida well knows, is a very unfortunate one from the beginning in every aspect of it. While I would desire to see a new leaf turned over, I should like to know just exactly what that leaf will cover.

Mr. CALL. If my honorable friend will allow me, I will say that that is not a very fair objection, when the committee bring in a bill, as I understand, appropriating the very money to a purpose forbidden by the treaty which I ask to be applied according to the spirit of the treaty.

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator point out the provision of the bill to which he refers?

Mr. CALL. I have not seen it in the bill, but I have no doubt it is there.

Mr. DAWES. It is not too late for the Senator to move an amendment to any portion of the bill, even when it comes into the Senate out of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CALL. I have not critically examined the bill. The practice of the Senate seems to be to bring in an appropriation bill and have it passed before anybody sees it.

Mr. DAWES. I am representing the Committee on Appropriations at this moment, and I am instructed by the committee to oppose amendments of this kind. However, my own personal objection does not rest upon the statement of the Senator, for that commends itself to me, but upon the uncertainty and dangerous character of any such amendment being adopted at this time.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he will consent to allow the amendment to be passed in such a form that the money shall be appropriated subject to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, allowing the Secretary to exercise his discretion on the subject?

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator will find the provision of the bill which appropriates the interest of the fund to the Seminoles, and will propose an amendment to the effect that so much of that shall be paid to the Seminoles in Florida as in the discretion of the Interior Department would be just and proper, I should think that would meet the point which he raises.

Mr. CALL. I have found the provision in the bill. Beginning at line 648, it reads as follows:

For 5 per cent. interest on \$250,000, to be paid as annuity (they having joined their brethren West) per eighth article of treaty of August 7, 1856, \$12,500.

I had not examined the bill, but I knew the provision was in it; it has been in all the former Indian appropriation acts.

The Committee on Indian Affairs have in their possession a communication from the Secretary of the Interior stating the fact that he has sent an agent to Florida, and that that agent has reported as to the number, I will not be positive but I think over three hundred of these Seminoles now remaining in the territory of Florida.

Mr. TELLER. Are they provided for in the bill?

Mr. CALL. No; the money is given to those in the West.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, it seems to me from the discussion which has taken place that the bill appropriates money which by treaty stipulation is to be paid to the Seminoles upon their removal to the West, and appropriates the whole of that sum to those who have now gone to the West, whereas by the statement of the Senator from Florida there is a portion of those Indians, some three hundred of them, in the State of Florida. The question with me is not whether those in Florida are entitled under treaty stipulations to any portion of the fund, but whether the whole amount of the appropriation should be made to a portion of the tribe who have gone west; whether there ought not to be an equitable distribution of it, and at least a certain percentage of the sum withheld for the benefit of those in Florida when they may comply with the terms by which they would be entitled to it. Those who have gone west are getting the whole of the appropriation, whereas those who have remained in Florida are getting none, and would get none after they go west, except the portion of the fund which is thus distributed from year to year. I think the appropriation ought to be limited according to

the number of Indians of the tribe who shall have joined their brethren in the West, and that the whole amount should not be given to them.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that, as I understand, we have no treaty with this small band in Florida. I think it is called the Tiger's Tail band, or by some such name. There is no treaty with them at all, as I understand.

Mr. CALL. Oh, no; I will state to my friend that he is mistaken.

Mr. TELLER. Perhaps so.

Mr. CALL. The treaty was with the united tribe of Seminoles; it was made here in Washington City, and participated in by the chiefs then in Florida. Under the treaty of 1856, with reference to the Indians in Florida, whose children are there now, and some of the very Indians are living at this time, it was provided that when they should emigrate west, the portion of the tribe which is referred to, then the interest upon this \$250,000 should be paid to the united tribe. Now, I say they have never removed; very few of them have gone west. The Secretary of the Interior has communicated the fact to the Committee on Indian Affairs. This communication is here in the committee-room; I know the fact; it was brought up here and read. This money which was to be paid when they migrated west has been appropriated every year, and the interest on the \$12,500 has been paid to the tribe in the West, as if the Indians now in Florida had gone there.

As to the treaty, of course the letter of the treaty has not been complied with. They cannot come here and say that they have fulfilled the obligations of the treaty. They have not done so. They are in Florida, and the stipulation was that they were to be paid only if they went west. But they have ceded their lands to the Government. That part of the consideration they have given. They have done more than that. They have abstained from hostilities. They have become peaceable and law-abiding people. They are there without homes, while the purpose of the treaty has been complied with and completed on their part in every essential particular except that they have not gone west.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Florida states the facts with great fairness, but in stating those facts he states the difficulty, which is that we cannot legislate in the manner in which he suggests without conflicting with the treaty and it may be with subsequent legislation. It is a very hard case for that remnant of the Seminoles who were at best driven out at the point of the bayonet, and at a terrible cost of life blood and treasure. What remain there have become absorbed in the population of Florida and are becoming to some extent useful members of society there. It would be right and proper that the Government should do something for their benefit; but the very statement of the treaty shows difficulties.

I suggest to the Senator that instead of moving his amendment upon this appropriation bill he ask Congress in a separate bill to provide some remedy for the hardship which exists in the case of the Seminoles who have remained in Florida.

Mr. TELLER. I was not mistaken when I said that we had no treaty with this small band in Florida. The treaty is with the other Seminoles; and it is provided that when those in Florida go with others who have already gone to the West, then a certain amount of money shall be paid in addition to what was otherwise agreed to be paid. We are under no treaty obligation to maintain the three or four hundred Indians in Florida, and unless we see fit we need not do so. If we see fit to make them a donation, of course we have a right to do it; but it cannot be said that we are violating any treaty obligation if we withhold any appropriation from that band of Indians.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether those Indians are not in fact a part of the Seminole tribe with which the treaty was made?

Mr. TELLER. No; they are not part of the tribe with which the treaty was made. The tribe with which the treaty was made agreed to send to Florida, which they did do, a certain delegation of their tribe for the purpose of inducing the Seminoles there to emigrate, and a great many of them did emigrate. As I understand, only three or four hundred are left. That is the fact. So the treaty made in 1856, of which we are speaking, made after the Seminole war, is a treaty with those who are now in the West, recognized by the Government as the Seminole tribe, and those in Florida are recognized as but stragglers from the tribe.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Was it a condition of the treaty that the Indians in Florida should be removed before the Seminoles in the West should be entitled to the interest on \$250,000?

Mr. TELLER. I have the treaty right here.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. Read it.

Mr. TELLER. This is what the treaty says on that point:

Also to invest for them the sum of \$250,000, at 5 per cent. per annum, the interest to be regularly paid over to them per capita as annuity; the further sum of \$250,000 shall be invested in like manner whenever the Seminoles now remaining in Florida shall have emigrated and joined their brethren in the West, whereupon the two sums so invested shall constitute a fund belonging to the united tribe of Seminoles, and the interest on which, at the rate aforesaid, shall be annually paid over to them per capita as an annuity; but no portion of the principal thus invested or the interest thereon annually due and payable, shall ever be taken to pay claims or demands against said Indians, except such as may hereafter arise under the intercourse laws.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. It would seem to me that no part of the interest on the \$250,000 ought to have been paid over until the Seminoles, then in Florida, had removed and joined their brethren in the West.

Mr. TELLER. That is the plain wording of the treaty.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. This bill appears to assume that they have already removed and joined their brethren in the West. That is the language of the bill in line 649.

Mr. DAWES. Some of them have moved and some have not, and I understand that those who have moved get all the interest on the fund.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. But it would seem from the provisions of the treaty that no part of the money ought to be paid over until they had all removed to the West.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It is a condition precedent.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. As stated by my friend from Delaware, that is made a condition precedent.

Mr. DAWES. Has the Senator the treaty before him?

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. The Senator from Colorado has just read that provision in the treaty. There seems to be a condition precedent.

Mr. HOAR. Is it not this case, Mr. President? I make it as an inquiry, not as an argument on either side; I do not know anything about it. The United States provided that when a tribe of Indians moved they should have the interest on \$250,000. A part of that tribe were willing to remove and a part were not. The United States, however, accepted the removal of a part as a valid removal. In fact the Government removed them. My impression is that they were removed with a line of bayonets immediately behind them, and they went in that manner; but that is a separate question. If the United States chooses to pay the whole or a part of the interest on that fund to the major portion of the tribe who have been so removed, what interest is it to those who remain, or what rightful claim have they? The Senator from Florida does not come in and say it is not a wise expenditure of Government funds to pay this money to the Indians who have gone to the Indian Territory, they being only a part of the tribe; but he says we should pay the Indians who have not complied with the condition, not the Indian who went but the Indian who adhered to his original resolution to stay. Is not that the fact about it?

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. No, I think that is not the fact. The Senator assumes that the Seminoles were not removed until after the treaty which has been referred to was entered into. It seems that the treaty was entered into in 1856, and according to my recollection the Seminoles were removed long years before that time.

Mr. HOAR. Not the people the treaty speaks of as Seminoles then remaining in Florida. The treaty says that when the Seminoles then remaining in Florida go, the tribe shall receive this sum of money.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. The treaty provides that the sum of money shall be paid to the entire tribe.

Mr. HOAR. Part of them have gone and part of them have not.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. The treaty assumes that none of them shall be paid until they have all gone.

Mr. HOAR. What reason is there for paying one cent to those who refuse to go?

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. What authority is there for paying one cent to any until they all go?

Mr. HOAR. It is the money of the United States, and the Government pays to whom it chooses.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. No; it is the money of the Seminoles, not the money of the United States. The United States holds it in trust for the benefit of the Seminoles.

Mr. HOAR. Where did they get it?

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. They got it in consequence of the sales of their land. It is a fund belonging to that tribe. It does not belong to the United States, but belongs to the Seminoles, and it was to be paid upon the happening of a certain event, which event has not yet happened.

Mr. TELLER. I have not looked this matter up, and I speak from recollection about it. My attention was called years ago to these Indians, and I have a pretty distinct recollection of them. The Indians who are now in Florida are a very small remnant of the Indians who were there when the treaty was made. Of the Indians who were referred to in the treaty of 1856 there was quite a large number of them. Most of them went west, and I believe it was claimed for some time that they had all gone. It was afterward learned that in the everglades there was a small band, which I think could not have exceeded three or four hundred, who had been left. I am informed that for a long time they had no connection with the white people at all, and the Government treated the matter as if they had all been removed under the treaty.

Mr. CALL. There is no doubt about the facts of this case, if Senators wish to vote in conformity with them. The appropriation bill proposes to pay \$12,500 under the obligation of the treaty. I say that that payment is in direct violation of the treaty. The treaty made in 1856, on the part of the United States and on the part of the Indians by certain Seminoles, some of whom were chiefs of the tribe then in Florida, provides as follows:

And whereas the United States desire by providing the Seminoles remaining in Florida—



In 1856—

with a comfortable home west of the Mississippi River, and by making a liberal and generous provision for their welfare, to induce them to emigrate and become one people with their brethren already west, and also to afford to all the Seminoles the means of education and civilization, and the blessings of a regular civil government—

Therefore they agree to invest the further sum of \$250,000—

in like manner whenever the Seminoles now remaining in Florida shall have emigrated and joined their brethren in the West.

There is no authority for the statement that the principal portion of the Seminoles, who in 1856 were in Florida, have ever emigrated west. It is a fact known to the records of the Interior Department here, and certified before the Committee on Indian Affairs in the last Congress, that there was no evidence that those Indians had ever emigrated to any considerable extent west, but there was evidence that there were then, as now, in the State of Florida an unknown number, from three to six hundred.

The treaty was made, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, by a part of the chiefs of the Seminoles, the chiefs and the tribe themselves then living in Florida and still living in Florida. One of those chiefs, by the name of Mico, when over a hundred years old, died but a few days ago. I will say to Senators that ever since the war Congress has been appropriating \$12,500 annually for the Seminoles of the West, who did take part in the great contest between the Northern and Southern States on the subject of secession, but the Indians in Florida remained entirely neutral in that contest. It is a singular spectacle, when we consider the equitable spirit and obligation of the treaty, made, as it declared, for the education of the Indians and for providing them with the means of support, the treaty stipulating that the Indians should extinguish their title to Indian lands in Florida, which was done, this tribe agreeing to it with the others, and the Government providing that for their education and support \$250,000 should be invested, but attaching the condition that the money should be paid when they went west. Every object which was intended to be provided for by their going west was accomplished. The Indians remaining in Florida have been peaceable, and they are satisfied, and the people are satisfied with them, and have been for twenty years. They live in a remote and inaccessible portion of the State. They have no homes; they have no means of being educated. They have no means of obtaining subsistence except by the permission of persons who own the land.

When I say to Senators that I ask them not to vote this money to the western tribe upon the ground that these Indians have gone west when there is no evidence that they have gone west, and there is evidence that a large number of them have not gone west, but to give it to those entitled to it, I am met with the objection of the Senator from Massachusetts that it may cause some conflict. Conflict with what? Not with the treaty; not with duty; not with benevolence; not with the proper spirit and purposes of the treaty. I venture to say to my learned friend, whose eloquence in behalf of the Indians has been so often heard, and heard with great effect and good purpose, that there is not a single reasonable objection that can be made.

The learned Senator from Colorado said that the treaty was not made with this tribe. I will grant it for the purpose of the argument, not for truth, because it was; but I will agree with him that it was not. What does it matter whether I make a compact with the Senator from Colorado to do a certain thing for the Senator from Iowa or some other Senator, or whether I make it directly with that Senator? The obligation is the same; the purpose is the same; there is no difference in the moral or the public obligation. So here it does not matter if the mere letter of the treaty was that these Indians were to go west. The object was to provide, as the treaty says, generously for them the means of education, and to produce quiet and good order in the State of Florida. That object has been accomplished. The title to the Indian lands has been extinguished, and every object of philanthropy and of good government demands that a part of the payment of \$12,500 interest should be appropriated to these poor wandering Indians, who have neither house nor home, having given to the Government of the United States the title to their land, as stipulated in the treaty.

Mr. DAWES. I would not object to the Senator's adding to the provision from line 648 to 652 these words:

No part of said sum shall be paid to any of such Indians who have not so joined their brethren west since the date of said treaty.

Mr. CALL. I am very much obliged to the Senator, but unless I can get the treaty carried out for the benefit of the Indians in Florida, who are entitled to it, I do not care to be niggardly about it, and the Senator can give it to anybody else he pleases. There is the plain treaty, and the object of the treaty, and the spirit and purpose of it; and my concern is that these poor wandering people in Florida, who have given their homes and their houses to the Government, shall receive some part of the consideration. Take off as much as you please from the allowance because of their not migrating west, but give them a consideration, a part at least, for their interest in the Indian title to the land in Florida, which the Government recognized and stipulated they would pay this money for.

Mr. DAWES. I should be very glad to yield if I could see my way clear in conformity with treaty stipulations to do so. I hope we may have a vote upon the amendment.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think this discussion has revealed facts here

that most of us do not appreciate. Here is a treaty made with the Seminole Indians. A provision was incorporated in that treaty to the effect that upon the removal of a portion of the tribe then existing in the State of Florida to join their brethren in the West the interest on the sum of \$250,000 should be paid to the Seminole Indians. A part of the Indians then resident in Florida have under that treaty stipulation removed west. Another part of the tribe within the State of Florida, including some of the chiefs with whom this treaty was made, still remains in the State of Florida. The proposition of the bill now is to pay the whole of the sum to the Indians who have gone west.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. That has been done heretofore.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It has been done time and again. There has been no recognition of those who remain in Florida, but the whole sum has been paid to that portion of the tribe which has removed west of the Mississippi.

There are equitable considerations in favor of the proposition of the Senator from Florida unquestionably. If there is a part of that tribe there, a part of the same body of men with whom this treaty was made still remaining there, some of whom have since died in the State of Florida, as I understand, there certainly is an equitable consideration that ought to address itself to the Senate as to whether the whole of this money should be paid to that portion of the tribe which has gone west and nothing to those who have remained in the State of Florida.

For my part I am perfectly willing that this appropriation should be made to the Indians, but not the whole of it to be made to that portion who have gone west, leaving entirely destitute and unprovided for the portion that remain in the State of Florida. An equitable distribution of this fund, it seems to me, ought to commend itself to the Senate. If some proposition to divide the sum shall be made, I certainly shall vote for it.

Mr. TELLER. The whole difficulty arises from the fact that Senators assume that the treaty was made with the Indians in Florida. The treaty was made in 1856 with the Indians who had already removed, and not with those in Florida.

Mr. CALL. A part of them.

Mr. TELLER. They especially go on and say in the treaty, as anybody can see after an examination of the treaty itself, (and it is a historical fact they had removed before that time,) that it is for the purpose of inducing the rest of them to remove that they make this treaty. They were Indians who came from the Indian Territory here to make the treaty. After they had made the treaty, then a portion of the Florida Indians went west, not a portion of those who had been engaged in making the treaty. The Government of the United States lost sight of the fact that there were any Indians in Florida, and for years did not know there were any Indians in Florida. Officially they do not know it to-day. There is nothing in the Indian Commissioner's report to show that there are any Indians in Florida that I have ever seen. In the statistics of the Indians there is no mention of them; but I am informed, as the Senator says, (I had understood it before, but of course if I had not I should rely upon his statement,) that there are three or four hundred Indians in Florida. However, we have no connection with them officially, and never have had any.

Mr. CALL. I will ask the Senator from Colorado to be kind enough to read that part of the treaty which shows that it was made by Indians who were not in Florida at the time.

Mr. TELLER. It may be found in the very first part of the treaty. I will read, commencing on page 105:

Whereas the convention heretofore existing between the Creek and Seminole tribes of Indians west of the Mississippi River has given rise to unhappy and injurious dissensions and controversies among them which render necessary a readjustment of their relations to each other and to the United States, &c.

It starts out in that way.

Mr. CALL. I will admit that.

Mr. TELLER. As a historical fact I think nobody will deny that the treaty was made here, and made with those western Indians.

Mr. CALL. I will admit that there is nothing in that clause which shows that any of the Indians in Florida had anything to do with the treaty. There is another clause, however. There are several clauses in this treaty. It also recites that—

Whereas the United States desire, by providing the Seminoles remaining in Florida with a comfortable home west of the Mississippi River, and by making a liberal and generous provision for their welfare, to induce them to emigrate and become one people with their brethren already west, and also to afford to all the Seminoles the means of education and civilization, and the blessings of a regular civil government.

Now, I will ask if there is anything there to show that there were no Florida Indians?

Mr. TELLER. I have never said that there were no Florida Indians. I have repeated that there were a number of Indians in Florida, but not holding official relations with the United States at that time.

Mr. CALL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TELLER. It was immediately after, or not long after, the Seminole war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. FARLEY in the chair.) The Senator from Florida is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CALL. I am glad to hear the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. I have asked a question.

Mr. CALL. I am obliged to the Senator; I am glad to hear him.

The fact is, I have great respect for my friend from Colorado and for his ability, but there is not a particle of reason in the suggestion he has made here to-day, nor a particle of fact. In 1856 the Government of the United States had an Indian war in Florida. Do you call that an official relation?

Mr. TELLER. No, not strictly.

Mr. CALL. It looked very much like it; and it was in consequence of that war, for which you will find large appropriations were made in the laws of this Government, that the treaty of 1856 was made. The Government of the United States have always had knowledge of the fact, if their officers had any kind of knowledge of the history of the country and the people who live in it, that there was a large portion, and I will say nearly the entire portion, of the Seminole tribe who were treated with in 1856 who have remained in Florida. That is a public fact acknowledged, and that is the history of it. John Jumper and Tuste-nuc-o-chee were Seminole Indians, and Jumper was one of the participants in the war of 1856. They brought those Creek Indians here to Washington City, and they brought some of the Seminoles who came in to Tampa Bay, as the officers of the Army will tell you, here to Washington in order that they might confer with the chiefs from the West and make a united treaty, and then go forward and induce the Seminoles in Florida, who had given the Government great expense and trouble, to emigrate to the West. They did go down there. The Seminoles were transported by the Government from the West, and met Jumper and others who were engaged in the war in Florida. They were sent out through the lines into the everglades and met with the Indians there and sought to induce them to go west. The result was that they carried a beggarly hundred Indians or something like that number to the West, but the chief portion of the tribe remained in the inaccessible swamps and everglades of Florida, and they have been there from that day to this unprovided for.

The very provisions of the treaty made for their benefit after the war have been converted by Indian agents and through the efforts of the Department here to another purpose, and the money has been paid to the Indians of the West, while these Indians are left without any kind of provision except private charity, and every day they are incited more or less to commit acts of violence on account of their extreme want and destitution.

The amendment which I propose is one that is very necessary for this Government. We had an Indian war in 1856. We may have another Indian war. Although these people are peaceable and well disposed, and are living upon land that is not yet desired for occupation, they have no homes, and they may be incited by a condition of want into a state of hostility which would cost the Government \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000. We only ask this little pittance per capita to be provided according to the spirit and the equity of the treaty. We do not claim the literal obligation of the treaty. These Indians have not gone west; they have no right to the money under the letter of the treaty; but they have ceded their lands. That is part of the consideration which they have given. They have become peaceable people; they have abstained from acts of violence; and they have conducted themselves in such a manner as to be satisfactory to the people of Florida as inhabitants and as citizens. We ask that they shall have some aid from the Government in the good work which they are commencing and which they may be unable to complete.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida, [Mr. CALL.]

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 10, noes 10; no quorum voting.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. There is a quorum here. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. If the Senator from Florida will say that these Indians in Florida are in need, and especially in need of schools for the purpose of education, I am perfectly willing to stand with him in putting a provision in the bill for their education; but if we adopt this amendment we shall get into interminable difficulty with the Seminoles.

In the first place, here is a treaty made in 1856, which treaty was made undoubtedly with the Seminoles west of the Mississippi. It is also true, however, that the remnant of the Seminoles in Florida participated in the treaty, as stated by the Senator from Florida, and the very fact that they participated in it is a reason why we should not do this thing. This sum was agreed to be given to the remaining Seminoles in Florida upon a condition, namely, that they should go and join their brethren in the Indian Territory and become a part of that tribe. They never did that.

The tribe in the Indian Territory have a right to this fund, because we gave it to them in a treaty, and if we divert a portion of this fund from those who are in the Indian Territory they can come back and rightfully ask us to make a full appropriation for them; and they will do it.

If this amendment is inserted it is establishing a principle which will require us to go back for the last twenty-four years and appropriate the money we have already paid to the Seminole Indians. We have had several cases of this kind. My friends from Florida would at once come in and ask for a new division in order to ascertain the amount that is due to the Seminoles in Florida, because of overpayments heretofore made.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin. It ought to be done.

Mr. ALLISON. My friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, is already converted to the theory, and says "it ought to be done." Now, I say it ought not to be done. These Indians have never shown themselves entitled to one single dollar of this fund; but I am willing, notwithstanding that, to give them whatever is necessary to promote their education and civilization in Florida, where they have remained, and doubtless desire to remain. But do not let us tamper with the provisions of the treaty requiring this fund to go to the Seminoles in the Indian Territory.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if we are not trifling with the provisions of the treaty when we take a fund only to be given on certain conditions, which conditions have not been complied with, and appropriate it to the Seminoles in the West?

Mr. ALLISON. If my friend from Delaware would enlarge his travel a little bit, and visit one of these tribes of Indians, he would find it exceedingly difficult to convince an Indian tribe that they are not entitled to a fund which is named in a treaty. They cannot split hairs and draw dividing lines as well as the Senator from Delaware can; and you could never make them understand that they are not entitled to this money as provided by the treaty.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. It was stated a little while ago by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] that the Government of the United States was utterly ignorant of the fact that there were any Indians in Florida. If that is true, it is a very strong criticism on the manner in which the Indian Bureau has been managed. I do not say that with the intention of reflecting on anybody, but it has been notorious to the entire people of the Union as a matter of common history that the whole Seminole tribe did not leave that State, and that from the time of the emigration of the main body up till now there has been in the State a very considerable remnant of the tribe, which has maintained its distinctive organization and lived separate and apart from the white portion of the community, not recognizing particularly any laws that govern and control the people of the State. They have been very inoffensive as a general thing, although some complaints at times have been made of a little lawlessness on their part. They live upon game and fish and the culture of small patches of corn, and they maintain their tribal organization regularly, just the same as they do in the Indian country.

A little while ago I called the attention of the Indian Bureau to the state of the Indians in Florida, and the then head of the Indian Bureau sent an officer down there to look into their condition. I think he made a report on the subject, which may be found somewhere in the files of the Indian Bureau; but he accomplished nothing. The truth is, he had no means at hand to do anything. He went down there on an exploring expedition and saw a few of the Indians but did not get to see the great body of them. He made a report in which I think he said that there are between four and five hundred Indians still there of the Seminole tribe; and they elect a chief and live within themselves, and have called upon the Government for nothing. I do not say that they call for anything now, but my colleague has stated their case for them.

They have a great dread of Washington, I have been told. They do not like to hear the name of Washington mentioned in the Indian country there, because of the traditions that have come down to them of the injustice which they say was perpetrated upon their forefathers. For one, I would be glad if that terrible prejudice should be removed now by something in the way of justice toward the surviving part of that celebrated tribe, because after having read with some interest the history of the operations of the American Army in Florida in order to exterminate the Indian tribe, I have been shocked, I confess, at some of the acts of our civilized officers there. It is true the Indians were to some extent to blame as savages, but there are some portions of our history that I could wish were not written in relation to the treatment of the Indians there. But they were removed, and the main body have gone west. There are four or five hundred remaining in the State, and I think the time has come to do something for them.

Inasmuch as the Constitution has vested the authority in this Government to deal with the Indians independent of the States, I see no reason why five hundred Indians, maintaining their tribal organization and living apart from the white community of Florida, should not be taken under the protecting care of this Government just the same as the Indians in the West. I will say in reply to the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. ALLISON,] who put the question awhile ago, that their condition imperatively requires the attention of the Government. They need education, they need attention, and they are in a condition I think to respond to any effort that may be honestly made to improve their situation. They have done more for themselves, I will say, living in that section, than any Indians in the whole country. They have no title absolutely to the land they live upon; they occupy it and roam upon it and cultivate little patches; but there is so much waste land in that section of the State owned by the Government that no question has been made about their occupancy; but the time may come when their title will be questioned. There are parties operating there now with a large grant of land, and what will become of these Indians in the event of white population coming in there in numbers, I am not prepared to say, but I am very sure that if anything can be done consistently and properly for their advancement, it ought to be done by the Government of the United States.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, upon the statement of the Senator



from Florida, as I intimated to his colleague some time ago, if he will withdraw this amendment and offer an amendment providing for the appropriation of say \$3,000 for the very purpose suggested here, I shall make no objection to it; but it seems to me the plainest reading of this treaty shows that we are in no position to take it from the interest of that fund. The fund itself was not to exist by the terms of the treaty, the fund was not to be created until after the Indians had gone west. Let me read:

The further sum of \$250,000 shall be invested in like manner whenever—

And not till then—

whenever the Seminoles now remaining in Florida shall have emigrated and joined their brethren in the West, whereupon the two sums so invested shall constitute a fund belonging to the united tribe of Seminoles, and the interest on which, at the rate aforesaid, shall be annually paid over to them per capita as an annuity.

The sum of \$250,000 has only been created as a fund, because in the opinion of the Government the Seminoles had removed west. It can have no existence except after they have removed west. Therefore, if the Senator will withdraw his amendment, upon his statement and that of his colleague, I do not believe any one will object to the adoption of an amendment appropriating \$3,000.

Mr. CALL. I will ask the Senator to say \$6,000 instead of \$3,000. That would be nearer. If he will say \$6,000 I will agree to his proposition.

I wish to submit a suggestion to the Senator from Massachusetts, in order that he may see how fully this case is a meritorious one. In the treaty made long precedent to this treaty, to wit, in 1823—and these treaties continue up to 1836 and 1856—providing for the cession of certain lands by these Indians in Florida, the United States stipulated by article 3:

The United States stipulate to continue to Eeonehatimico, his sub-chiefs and warriors, their proportion of the annuity of \$5,000 to which they are entitled under the treaty of Camp Moultrie so long as the Seminoles remain in the Territory, and to advance their proportional amount of said annuity for the balance of the term stipulated for its payment in the treaty aforesaid whenever the Seminoles finally remove in compliance with the terms of the treaty concluded at Payne's Landing on 9th May, 1832.

Under the provisions of that article of the treaty the sub-chiefs of the tribe held, and held with perfect right, that they had a right to remain in the Territory of Florida until they agreed themselves to go away, and that that stipulation of the Government for which they had conveyed their land was obligatory upon the Government in their favor as sub-chiefs. It is under that construction of the precedent treaty that the Indians refused to comply with the treaty made in Washington City by Jumper and others in their behalf.

Now, I hope the Senate will not disregard the positive obligation of this Government to pay these annuities to these Indians long before they were merged in the treaty of 1856, and which has never received the assent of those chiefs there. I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts to make the amount \$6,000, which is a sum wholly inadequate for the three hundred Indians that are there, and I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, I observed with great satisfaction the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. JONES] when he said that the name of Washington was odious to these people. I think on the whole that the Government's dealing with the Indians has not added very greatly to that name, and I think the more that has been given to them the worse they have been off. I think to-day the Senator from Florida who last spoke [Mr. CALL] is the worst enemy these Indians have in asking that the Government shall intrude itself upon them and their affairs to expend for their benefit nominally the money which he asks shall be expended.

Mr. CALL. How is that? I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. PLUMB. I will elaborate the idea. Some years ago the Government made a treaty with the Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indians, whereby those tribes affiliated for the time being and agreed to remove to the Indian Territory. When the time came for them to go, some of them, thinking of the running water, and of the grass, and of all the associations of the country in which they had lived, said they would not go at all, and did not go. The remainder of them went to the Indian Territory; they entered into treaty relations with the Government; they received annuity goods; they received in addition donations from the Government of beef, of flour, of coffee, of sugar, and of various things that were intended for their comfort, for their convenience, and for their support. It was not long until some of those who had gone below and had been thus fed, mindful of the attractions of the home of their fathers and of the places in which they themselves had lived, concluded to go back, and did go back, and received punishment for breaking away from the reservation. But those who did not go down there, a large portion of them, had located upon a military reservation on the Yellowstone River at Fort Keogh, received no bounty, no annuity, no allowance, no food, no clothing, no annuity goods, no trinkets, and they have remained there from that day to this, supporting themselves, and they are better off to-day than those who went to the Indian Territory and received the bounty from the Government.

I venture to say that the condition of the Seminole Indians who are in Florida, and who receive nothing from the Government, is better in every way, physically, mentally, in matters of comfort, convenience, support, and everything that goes to make up the things that men live for, than the Seminole Indians who receive annuities from the Government and live in the Indian Territory. It is just as

true of an Indian as it is of a white man, that a thing that does not cost him anything is not worth anything. The gifts we give the Indians to-day are the burdens under which they labor. If it were in the power of the Government to take away from all the Indians under treaty relations to-day every single dollar we give them, those Indians, with possibly very rare exceptions, would be better off. It is a mistaken kindness. The Indian no more than the white man cares for a thing which does not cost anything to him. The Seminole Indians of Florida, living in the Everglades where Billy Bowlegs lived and where he fought and where he died, are better off without the reception of a single dollar of the bounty of the Government, without the intervention of the Government, without its control, without its interference, than the Seminoles are who live in the Indian Territory and receive \$25,000 a year as annuity from the funds which the Government has invested for their benefit.

Possibly that does not affect the equities of this case. Possibly, and I might say probably, on the statement of the Senators from Florida, who are familiar with all the facts of the case, the Indians in Florida ought to receive a *pro rata* proportion of this money. But this treaty which was made with them was made upon the theory, supported at the time no doubt by facts, that it was the interest of the Indians and the interest of the Government that the Seminoles should go west. They did not choose to go. Like the Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes of whom I have spoken, they chose to abide by the graves of their fathers, by the birth-places of their children. They chose it because of climatic considerations as well, and they are better off to-day, as I said, where they are than they would be if they had removed.

But the Government dealt with them as a tribe upon the plan and the practice which was then in vogue of regarding the chief as the exponent, as the spokesman, as the organ of the tribe and authorized to speak for them, and not regarding fractions of the tribe, not regarding the sub-chiefs, not regarding heads of families, not regarding individual Indians at all, but alone those who were constituted by reason of their position as chiefs to speak for the tribe and in its relations to the Government about all these matters that concerned the tribe.

Now, if we are to break away from that at this time we involve ourselves in our relations with all the Indian tribes with whom we have heretofore dealt, because, as I have said, here are a portion of the Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes abiding now on the Yellowstone River who did not go south, notwithstanding the fact that the chiefs of those tribes agreed that they should go. We involve ourselves in our relations with the Cherokees of North Carolina, who are somewhat similarly situated perhaps. In other words, we are introducing a disturbing element, a new element, in our dealings with Indians in regard to transactions which have been considered as settled and finally disposed of; and who shall tell where it will end?

We say here we will give members of the Seminole tribe who have remained in Florida a *pro rata* proportion of the funds to which they may be equitably entitled in common with others who have gone west of the Mississippi River, and that of course makes a question of computation. It induces the Indians perhaps, who have gone west of the Mississippi River, to come back. It interferes with the purpose the Government had in requiring them to go west, and in locating them in the new territory. It applies equally to a great many other tribes, and the moment we have done this we shall be obliged to recast our relations with all these other tribes and recompute the annuities; and the moment that is done there will come a claim for back annuities. If these Indians are entitled to a portion of this fund now, they were entitled to it last year and the year before and the year before that, and for fifteen years preceding.

It seems to me we ought to consider these Indians in Florida not as a portion of the Seminole band of Indians in treaty relations with the Government, under the article of this treaty which says a certain sum shall be set apart for their benefit, but simply as a class of people who are by reason of their circumstances and of their race wards of the nation, and if such wards of the nation entitled to whatever may be deemed to be their due on account of their dependent condition. Are they so dependent? We do not know it in any way except as the Senators from Florida state it. What I mean to say is, that wherever hunger pervades a class of people we are apt to hear about it. Wherever destitution prevails we hear about it. If these people have not been fed, and have not been clothed, and if they have not taken care of themselves, we should have heard about it in some way. They would have spoken louder than the voice of the Senators from that State, as it seems to me. I do not want to disparage their statement at all; I do not question the accuracy of their information, or of their statement, but I say that when we come to consider it in view of all the considerations that I have presented, it does not present itself in an attitude that requires us to take away the moneys which have been provided to be paid to the Seminole tribe of Indians, and not to individual members of the tribe, nor does it require us to take funds from the Treasury of the United States in order that these Indians may get their proportion.

Mr. CALL. I will not weary the Senate by any reply to the Senator from Kansas. I will only say that it may be very true that a man may be better off without a house and without any clothes to wear or any land, but I do not think the Senator entertains that opinion in regard to the homestead laws. I have further to say, that in regard to this treaty I have read the provision of the treaty by

which this money was to be paid out per capita, by the head, to those in Florida and those west; not to the united tribe, but when they became united. The Senator from Kansas does not regard that, but that is the treaty.

I have further read the treaty of 1823, which stipulated with the sub-chiefs that this Government would pay them \$5,000 a year for that portion of the tribe of the Seminoles as long as they remained in Florida.

Now, what kind of answer is it to say that we treated with the united tribe in 1856? In 1823 and in 1836 the Government of the United States solemnly stipulated that they would pay \$5,000 per year to that portion of the tribe as long as they should remain in the Territory of Florida, and these sub-chiefs stand here, and stood in 1856, and from then until now, and said: "How can you by a treaty made in Washington City surrender our rights and the plighted faith of the Government in 1823?" You cannot answer such a proposition as that. It is a simple fact, and the honorable Senator's argument about the Indians being better off when they have nothing to wear and nothing to do, may be very correct for aught I know as applied to Indians in the West, but it is not so as applied to those in Florida. The Indians in Florida, as everybody knows, are now being confined into a narrower scope of country. The wonderful production of the country, its natural production, is being taken away from them; the area is being circumscribed. There is a canal being cut in the Everglades, and they no longer have the means of living. Now, I will accept the offer of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] if he will make the amount \$6,000.

Mr. TELLER. For education?

Mr. CALL. And agriculture; whatever the Secretary sees fit. The honorable Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] will be able to judge of that.

Mr. DAWES. Call it \$5,000.

Mr. CALL. Very well.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Florida what is the per capita appropriation to the Indians of the tribe, for it seems to me if this agreement between the Senators from Massachusetts and Florida is to be ratified by the Senate, the amount should be fixed according to the per capita allowance to the Indians in the tribe, and not a mere guess as a round sum that is to be appropriated to the remaining Indians in Florida.

Mr. DAWES. I understand that it allows \$6 for each Indian as it is paid out now in the Seminole country. There are about two thousand of them.

Mr. HOAR. I yielded the floor to my honorable friend from Florida on the expectation that he had a brief amendment which would take two minutes. It has now taken an hour and a half.

Mr. CALL. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I am very sorry to have occupied his time. I accept the offer of the other Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] for \$5,000, and withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida withdraws his original amendment, and will send up the amendment he now offers.

Mr. PLUMB. I desire to state in answer to the Senator from Tennessee—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment be reported.

Mr. PLUMB. I will state now for the purpose of answering the question, the number of Seminole Indians on the Indian reservation at the last estimate was 2,636—that is in the Indian Territory. The amount of annuity they receive is \$12,500.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. We have no official report of the number in Florida, because—

Mr. DAWES. I hope the amendment as modified will be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] offers an amendment, which will be read.

The ACTING SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert:

That \$5,000 be, and the same is hereby appropriated for the establishment of schools and the purchase of land, agricultural implements, and seeds, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Where is this to come in?

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] will indicate.

Mr. TELLER. It might be put on page 28, after line 662.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida accept that suggestion?

Mr. CALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BECK. Is there any recommendation from any Department of the Government in regard to this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator raise the point of order?

Mr. ALLISON. There is a recommendation of the two Senators from Florida.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I ask the Senator from Kentucky if he wants a response to his question?

Mr. BECK. Certainly.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I want to know if it is a fixed principle governing the action of this body that it is powerless to do anything in the interest of justice or to promote the cause of education, as in this case, without a recommendation from a Department?

Mr. BECK. I desire to say that that is no answer at all to the question I asked. I asked the question, a very proper one, whether there was any recommendation, and I am asked in return if the Sen-

ate is powerless to do anything without a recommendation. Does the Senator think that an answer to my question?

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I do.

Mr. BECK. The Senator says he does.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. Because if we are capable of doing justice in this case outside of the recommendation of the Department, it seems to me its recommendation is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. BECK. Then all the rules of the Senate requiring recommendations of heads of Departments or recommendations of committees are absurd, according to the suggestion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. Does the Senator raise that point?

Mr. BECK. I do not raise any point. I say the answer I received was no answer at all, and it is always a suspicious circumstance when Senators will not go before either of the committees that are appointed to investigate all these matters, and bring in bills in accordance with representations based on facts carefully considered, nor to ask for a recommendation from the heads of the Department, nor to venture before committees of either House, to state where these Indians are and whether they can be captured at all to be educated.

I want to know of the Senator from Florida how many of those young Indians to whom this \$5,000 is to be paid for education can in his opinion be caught even, far less be put inside of a school-house, or whether it is not some effort to make an appearance of seeming to obtain education for Indians that are not in a condition to be educated, and that would never be educated, even if the money were given? How many Indian children of school age can now be gathered together at any point in Florida to be got inside of a school-house? That is a proper question.

Mr. JONES, of Florida, rose.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] which the Secretary will report.

The ACTING SECRETARY. At the end of line 662 it is proposed to insert:

For the Seminole Indians in Florida \$5,000, and the same is appropriated for the establishment of schools, for the purchase of land, agricultural implements, and seeds, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I wish to reply to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senator from Massachusetts yielded his proposition, which was the pending question.

Mr. BECK. I want an answer to my question.

Mr. HOAR. Has any point of order been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No point of order has been made.

Mr. JONES, of Florida. The Government has for years been spending millions of dollars upon the Indians of the United States, outside of Florida, and according to the best information I have there are from three hundred to five hundred Indians maintaining a distinct organization in Florida in need, without one dollar having been expended upon them. The Senator from Kentucky thinks it is late to make any appeal for them now. I do not think so. A year ago an officer from the Indian Bureau went down there and looked into their condition, but there was no money in the Bureau by which to enable them to do anything. He made a report, and I think stated their number to be near five hundred, there living separate and apart from the white community. The question is whether this little sum of \$5,000 ought to be granted now.

Mr. BECK. How many children are there?

Mr. JONES, of Florida. I cannot tell, because no census taker has ever been permitted to go near them.

Mr. BECK. If a census taker is not permitted to go near them, how can you educate them when you cannot catch them?

Mr. JONES, of Florida. You might apply that to some of the wild Indians of the West. I think if the money is appropriated it will be applied to the purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, [Mr. CALL.]

Mr. ALLISON. Let it come in after line 1159.

Mr. CALL. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I now call up the amendment which was temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. HOAR.]

The ACTING SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, contained between lines 1205 and 1215 inclusive, the Senator from Massachusetts proposes to insert:

And the Secretary of the Interior is further authorized and directed to provide for the care, support, and education of all Indian children dwelling west of the Mississippi and not belonging to the five civilized tribes in the Indian Territory, or so many thereof as may be practicable, under such regulations as may be approved by the President, in any of the States, at a cost not exceeding \$200 per annum for each child; and for this purpose there is appropriated \$2,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. PLUMB. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to yield a moment so that we can dispose of a formal amendment which may be overlooked. I move to add at the close of line 1154, after the word "dollars:"

Provided, That no portion of this appropriation shall be used in the payment of police for service among the five civilized tribes in the Indian Territory.



I have the assent of such members of the committee as I have consulted.

Mr. DAWES. I hope that will be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. Now, in lines 441 and 446, I move to strike out the word "western," which is a matter of surplusage; so that it will read "Miami Indians" instead of "delegation of the western Miami Indians."

Mr. DAWES. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I wish to submit a few remarks to the Senate in favor of the amendment which has been read, and before doing so I desire to express my pleasure that the Committee on Appropriations in reporting this bill, and the Senate in adopting the amendments which have been already proposed by the committee, have taken two very important steps in Indian education, steps which I think determine the principle which, if acted upon, will remove from our legislation the Indian problem in the course of five or ten years, which will put an end to the alarm felt by every frontiersman whose dwelling is within reach of an Indian warlike expedition, and to the necessity of vast expenditures in the suppression of Indian hostilities and the control of Indians who are nominally at peace. The committee have proposed and the Senate have established the office of inspector of Indian education, and have made it the duty of that officer to conceive and report a complete practicable scheme for the education of all the Indian children in the country. They have added a small but substantial sum to the appropriation for the object of Indian education, which will enable the experiment that I think has already been sufficiently tried to be further tried within the next twelve months; an appropriation which cannot be supported except upon a principle that requires Congress to extend the benefit which the committee extend to one or two hundred Indian youths to every Indian youth of school age in the country. So, then, I do not conceive myself as antagonizing, to use a modern phrase, the opinion to which the Committee on Appropriations have committed themselves and the Senate.

There are in the United States, not including Alaska, 246,417 persons of Indian blood now under the control of the agents of the Government. Of these 59,277 are in five self-supporting civilized tribes in the Indian Territory; 15,030 others are in the powerful and populous States of New York and Michigan, far removed from the western frontier. The necessary agencies for their control and the necessary agencies for their education and civilization can be easily wielded by those States on such terms and at such time as they and Congress may agree. There are left 172,110 persons, most of them dwelling west of the Mississippi, who present to our consideration what is called the Indian problem. The first consideration which strikes us is the pettyness of this force which has baffled the statesmanship and defied the strength and dishonored the fair fame of the American people for so many years, and, unless we change our policy, seems likely to do so for so many years to come. The whole of them are not a two-hundredth part—those we have left to deal with are not a two hundred and ninetieth part of the population of the country. There are hardly enough of them for a Congressional district. If gathered into a city they would be the eleventh in size of our cities. Feeble in numbers, they are made feebler still by ignorance and barbarism. They are divided from each other by ancient feuds and by differences of language. If the United States should cease to feed them a large portion of them would starve. If the Government did not protect them the fighting strength of any one of ten Massachusetts cities with the resources of civilization would be enough to exterminate them from the continent. With the exception of the five tribes I have referred to they have probably continued nearly stationary in numbers since the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth. The best statistical authorities declare that the Indians are not a perishing or dying race. Major Clark, an accomplished statistician, has shown conclusively that the Indians within our dominions have slightly increased during the past thirty years, and are now increasing, and that it is at least quite doubtful whether there were more Indians upon this continent when the first white man landed than are here now.

His conclusions agree with those of Major Powell, who is perhaps our most accomplished ethnologist. Colonel Mallery, in his paper read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in August, 1877, sums up the matter as follows:

The conclusions submitted are that the native population of the territory occupied by the United States at its discovery has been wildly overestimated; that while many of its component bodies have diminished, or been destroyed by oppression and violence, their loss has been in part compensated by gain among others; that the "blight" and "withering," or *feræ naturæ* theory, is proved absolutely false, and that though some temporary retrogradation must always be expected among individual tribes at the crisis of their transition from savagery or barbarism to more civilized habits, yet now the number of our Indians is on the increase, and will naturally so continue unless repressed by causes not attributable to civilization, but to criminal misgovernment, until their final absorption into the wondrous amalgam of all earth's peoples, which the destiny of this country may possibly effect.

Feeble, infinitely feeble and petty, is the power of the Indian,

when we compare his numbers or his military resources with our own. But in wealth the comparison is still more to his disadvantage. Against the few ponies and herds and household implements which make up the bulk of the personal possessions of the race that once were lords of this continent, is opposed a valuation of thirty-three thousand millions of dollars, standing third on the list of civilized nations, and only exceeded by Great Britain and France. The average annual income of our fifty millions of people, men, women, and children, is \$165, an average exceeded by no other nation, and equaled by but one. Our wealth has increased during the past ten years at the annual rate of eight hundred and twenty-five millions. It is now undoubtedly increasing at the annual rate of at least a thousand millions. The sum which has been set in this bill as the outer limit of the sum needed to secure this race from barbarism, a sum, I believe, much larger than is needed, is not more than three-tenths of 1 per cent. of that which each year adds to the accumulated capital of the country, not more than the gain made in a single working day.

The question what one of these two powers shall do with the other is one which, it would seem, the experience of a hundred years might have settled. We have tried many experiments. I think the time has come when the country should render its final judgment. We are able now, I think, to determine without great difficulty three of the essential elements for the solution of the Indian problem:

1. The capacity of the Indians for education, for civilization, for citizenship.

2. What it costs not to educate him.

3. What it costs to educate him.

The capacity of the Indian for civilization and for a very high degree of intellectual development has been proved by numerous individual instances. But I prefer to rest this point on one very touching and decisive piece of evidence from an official Indian source, whose authority is beyond question. I quote entire the last thanksgiving proclamation of D. W. Bushyhead, the present principal chief of the Cherokee Nation:

Last year the census of the population and possessions of the Cherokee Nation was first taken within their history. We have now counted our treasures and know for what and for how much we should feel grateful as a family of people having and occupying one home in common. From this authentic source we find our people blessed with one hundred and two primary schools for a rapidly-increasing population of 20,300 citizens; two high schools, male and female; an orphan asylum, an asylum for the unfortunate—insane, blind, and helpless; forty-five churches and as many native ministers of the gospel; one hundred and fifty native teachers by profession; a written constitution and code of laws; a government consisting of executive, legislative, and judicial branches, well understood and administered; a people peaceful and progressive, and in all material regards more than self-supporting; and having but five fishermen and fifteen hunters by occupation left among them as the last vestige of a savage state from which we have been rescued within the memory of men yet living by the goodness of an overruling Providence.

Such is the situation of the Cherokee Nation to-day, in the fair and ample country secured to them by treaty and by patent, and of which the honor and honesty of their great earthly protector, the United States Government, is pledged to guard their possession.

Such are the blessings for which our thanks are continually due, among which blessings the first and best of all is saving knowledge whence they come and a sense of obligation which restrains pride.

Therefore I, D. W. Bushyhead, principal chief of the Cherokee Nation, do hereby, in pursuance of an ancient Christian custom and the recommendation of the President of the United States, appoint Thursday, November 24, A. D. 1881, as a day of public thanksgiving throughout this nation, and call upon the Cherokee people to devote the time designated to the giving of expressions and evidences of their thankfulness to the Supreme Being for His kindness and love, in such ways and by such observances as shall become a Christian, orderly, and conscientious people. Let us thank Him for all His dispensations, as gifts of His goodness for our good, never forgetting that blessings are such indeed only when used in the cause of the Great Giver, which is the happiness of all alike; and that the results of our shortcomings are but benevolent cautions against evil—no less blessings, if we so regard them, than the happy consequences of virtuous life.

I have here also a report made on the 16th of March by Mr. Pollock, the Indian inspector, to the Secretary of the Interior, giving an account of the success of the education at the Indian school at Carlisle, under Captain Pratt, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, INDIAN INSPECTION SERVICE,  
Aurora, Illinois, March 16, 1882.

SIR: Complying with your instructions of the 6th instant, I proceeded to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and there remained five days familiarizing myself with the conduct and general management of the training school for Indian youth at that place, under the charge of Captain R. H. Pratt, and I have now the honor to submit the following report:

That school was commenced by Captain Pratt on the 1st day of November, 1879, with 147 Indian children in attendance as pupils, most of whom could not understand or speak a word of the English language, some of whom had never seen a white man before starting out on their journey to Carlisle.

Of the 147 present at the opening of the school, 86 were Sioux, the others being from ten different agencies.

At different times since the arrival of the original 147 children there have been received 199 others, from 17 different tribes; so that at this writing 27 different languages might be spoken there, and yet there is but one, the English.

Of the 346 Indian children brought to Carlisle, 14 boys and 5 girls have died; 48 boys and 12 girls have been returned to their tribes; 17 boys and 6 girls are out with benevolent families learning civilized pursuits; leaving 164 boys and 80 girls now in actual attendance at the school.

Of these, 9 of the boys are apprentices in the tin shop, 9 in the tailor shop, 14 in the harness shop, 9 in the shoe shop, 9 in the blacksmith and wagon shop, 10 in the carpenter shop, from 1 to 3 on the farm, and 2 in the bakery.

The girls by regular details work in the sewing-room and in the dining-room and kitchen.

All are required to spend half of each day in school, so that they are acquiring a knowledge of the mechanical arts and an education, as well at one and the same time, and I may add, the progress they have made in each is certainly wonderful. By the girls all their own clothing is made, and many of them have learned to be both useful and graceful in the dining-room and kitchen; while in the different

shops the boys make not only their own clothing, but also tinware, harness, boots and shoes, wagons, and all kinds of iron work and carpenter work in all its forms, including the building of a hospital, repairs at and about the school buildings and grounds, &c. And, strange as it may seem, a brass band composed entirely of Indian boys, who two and a half years ago were running wild in the woods, daily discourses sweet music, in "civilized strains," and the progress of the children generally in the knowledge of letters has been no less remarkable. But for fear of being tedious I might go into details and show the amounts of different articles manufactured in the shops, considerable quantities of which have been shipped to and used at different Indian agencies.

The per capita expenses of subsisting these children from October 5, the date of the first arrival at Carlisle, to December 31, 1879, was 16.10 cents per day; from January 1 to December 31, 1880, 14½ cents per day; and from January 1 to December 31, 1881, 11.62 cents per day, while the aggregate cost to the Government of this most humane and promising undertaking in Indian civilization from its inception to December 31, 1881, including the cost of chapel, hospital, all repairs and fixtures, and all expenditures of every kind amounts to only \$147,052.18. In addition to that sum, up to March 10, 1882, benevolent people have given to Captain Pratt in aid of this school \$12,431.86, of which gratuity the captain has a balance on hand of \$707.91. For a hundred years the Government has been struggling with the "Indian question," during which time it has dispossessed the Indians of nearly all their lands and spent hundreds of millions trying to reconcile them to our "civilization." In resisting our kind offices they have occasionally committed some excesses.

If a tithe of the money spent by the Government in cruel and aggressive wars had been expended in educating Indian children in schools similar to the one at Carlisle, the Indian problem would have long since been solved, and our Government might with some degree of pride have pointed to its treatment of those people whom it has dispossessed of a continent.

A wise and intelligent policy would suggest the establishment of a school or schools similar to that at Carlisle in every Western State and Territory, and the consequent cessation of Indian wars.

Soon thereafter would the enlightened Christian influence of educated Indian children become dominant among the tribes, and not as now be merged and lost among the heathenish rites which now prevail among them.

The personnel of the employé force (thirty-five in number) at Carlisle is good—perhaps on the male side, in some particulars, it might be better.

Captain Pratt himself, is one of the very few persons fitted by nature and by education to successfully handle and manage Indians.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WM. J. POLLOCK, Inspector.

Hon. S. J. KIRKWOOD,

Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

There are few more significant historic illustrations of the truth that the ways of transgressors are hard than are to be found in the penalties which have attended the dealing of this nation with the Indians. Let us see, so far as can be ascertained and approximately estimated, what this race of 250,000 persons have cost us since 1789, which would have been saved if they had been peaceful, self-supporting citizens. In the first place, let us take the items which appear on the books of the Treasury, specifically charged to the Indian service. I will read a letter addressed to me by Mr. Bayley, the very able and learned statistician at the Treasury, with its accompanying papers:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, WARRANT DIVISION,  
May 18, 1881.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your memorandum of the 20th ultimo, containing the following interrogatories:

1. The cost of Indian wars.
2. The cost of Indian supplies and transportation, (excluding proceeds of funds which were equivalents for ceded lands.)
3. The cost of Indian education, in gross and per capita.

In reply thereto, I herewith inclose a statement showing the expenditures on account of the Indians by decades, from 1789 to 1880. An analysis of this statement shows the following expenditures:

|                                  |                |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Indian wars.....                 | \$8,175,046 90 |
| Transportation and supplies..... | 25,892,948 94  |
| Education.....                   | 3,949,112 98   |
| Miscellaneous purposes.....      | 149,141,426 40 |
| Total.....                       | 187,158,535 22 |

From this amount there should be deducted, however, on account of moneys received and covered into the Treasury on account of Indians from 1789 to 1880, inclusive, the sum of \$23,464,931.32, making the net expenditures from the organization of the present form of government to June 30, 1880, inclusive, \$163,693,603.90.

I have made a careful examination of the expenditures on account of the military establishment, and estimate the expenses incurred on account of the several Indian wars, for the period mentioned, to amount to \$100,998,883.86.

In this connection, it may be proper for me to state that I have found it a most difficult task to separate these expenses, for the reason that the different accounts are merged together in such a way as to render it almost impossible to distinguish in most cases the amount rightfully to be deducted on account of Indian wars from the expenses incident to the other branches of the military service. I have used every exertion to procure from different sources the data from which I could form a comparison, yet have succeeded in but few instances. Such as I have been able to find I inclose herewith.

In studying these expenses, I find that in nearly every case where Indians have forfeited their rights under treaty stipulations, by open war, the Government has restored them to favor by new treaties, re-establishing them by new provisions in lieu of former stipulations to meet the changes incident to the growth of the country and the advance of Indian civilization, and, in many cases, by an increase of annuities and other obligations on the part of the Government.

Believing it might be of some service to you, I have had prepared a statement of the whole expenditures on account of the Indian service, from 1789 to 1876, showing the net amount expended during this period, under each specified head of appropriation, which I transmit herewith. If you can spare the time to look it over, I shall be glad to make any compilation from it which you may be pleased to mark, and I would thank you to return it at your convenience, as I have only the rough draft of the copy from which it is made.

I inclose also a copy of a statement prepared by myself some time since, showing all the receipts from 1789 to 1873, inclusive, and by reference to pages 9 to 13 you will notice the different sources from whence these Indian moneys came into the Treasury. A similar statement in details by years, from 1789 to 1880, is nearly ready for printing.

Trusting these papers may prove satisfactory, and that you will consider me at your service at any and all times,

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. A. BAYLEY.

Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR,  
United States Senate.

Statement showing the expenditures of the United States in the civilization and support of the various tribes of Indians, from March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1880, arranged by decades, as given by the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report for 1880.

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| 1791 to 1800..... | \$317,263 88  |
| 1801 to 1810..... | 1,644,328 84  |
| 1811 to 1820..... | 3,173,834 68  |
| 1821 to 1830..... | 5,984,653 17  |
| 1831 to 1840..... | 26,546,498 95 |
| 1841 to 1850..... | 13,836,346 31 |
| 1851 to 1860..... | 32,535,807 35 |
| 1861 to 1870..... | 38,577,890 15 |
| 1871 to 1880..... | 64,541,961 89 |

|                                    |                |
|------------------------------------|----------------|
| Total.....                         | 187,158,535 22 |
| From which should be deducted..... | 23,464,931 32  |

Being the amount received into the Treasury on account of Indians from 1789 to 1880, inclusive, leaving as actual net expenditures..... 163,693,603 90

Statement of reimbursements to certain States on account of expenses incurred in suppressing Indian hostilities.

|                                   |              |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Tennessee, 1794.....              | \$13,795 54  |
| Georgia, 1827 to 1857.....        | 423,954 60   |
| Illinois, 1828 to 1847.....       | 819,464 18   |
| Missouri, 1832 to 1834.....       | 9,341 79     |
| Florida, 1836 to 1861.....        | 1,923,152 79 |
| Tennessee, 1837 to 1860.....      | 202,219 76   |
| City of Mobile, 1841 to 1846..... | 48,595 13    |
| Alabama, 1846 to 1854.....        | 120,574 79   |
| Alabama, 1849 to 1854.....        | 69,137 99    |
| Georgia, 1851 to 1879.....        | 128,242 32   |
| Florida, 1852 to 1857.....        | 164,742 29   |
| Oregon, 1853 to 1868.....         | 165,014 22   |
| South Carolina, 1854 to 1872..... | 1,164,507 94 |
| California, 1854 to 1872.....     | 1,145,138 89 |
| Utah, 1856 to 1857.....           | 19,690 65    |
| Arkansas, 1859.....               | 1,212 00     |
| Minnesota, 1859 to 1863.....      | 1,247 37     |

Total..... 5,274,893 36

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington City, December 3, 1866.

SIR: In compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives of June 7, 1866, directing the Secretary of War to inform the House what amount of money has been expended for the suppression of Indian hostilities, &c., during the years 1864 and 1865, I have the honor to send herewith reports on the subject from the Quartermaster-General, the Commissary-General of Subsistence, and the Paymaster-General, from which it will be seen that—

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| The Quartermaster's Department expended in |                |
| 1864.....                                  | \$9,110,372 00 |
| 1865.....                                  | 19,263,856 00  |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| The Subsistence Department expended in |            |
| 1864.....                              | 155,459 74 |
| 1865.....                              | 359,788 46 |

|                                    |              |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| And the Pay Department expended in |              |
| 1864.....                          | 508,953 95   |
| 1865.....                          | 1,132,512 78 |

And that the total expenditures in 1864 and 1865 amount to... 30,530,742 93

Some of the above information having been only recently received, this report could not be made in time for the last session of Congress, but the earliest opportunity is now taken for presenting it.

Your obedient servant,

EDWIN M. STANTON,  
Secretary of War.

Hon. SCHUYLER COLFAX,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This sum is a very small part of what the Indians have cost us. It does not include the proportion of the general expense of the Army attributable to that part of it engaged in Indian wars. It does not include the pay of officers or men. It does not include the cost of so much of the Army as must be maintained in peace by reason of the danger of Indian wars. It does not include the cost of volunteer troops or the sums repaid to States. It does not include pensions to the wounded or the widows or children of the slain. It does not include the destruction of property by the Indians themselves, or the effect upon the value of a large extent of territory by reason of Indian possession or neighborhood. It does not include the sums expended for Indian supplies, or the meager sums actually expended in a wasteful and improvident way for Indian civilization and education. Some of these things could never be ascertained.

But I believe it is safe to affirm that this country has expended and lost since Washington took the oath of office fully a thousand million of dollars which it would have saved if our 210,000 Indians had been ordinary self-supporting farmers or mechanics. In this I reckon the principal of the expenditure and loss only. The interest on the interest of this sum, annually expended, would be enough to civilize and educate every Indian child of school age within our limits. I believe that this expenditure, continued for a few years, would save the necessity for any further expense to the Government on Indian account, except such as is required by treaties as an equivalent for lands purchased.

I do not propose to recount the hundred-times-told tale of the cruelty and breach of faith and rapacity and dishonor that have accompanied our dealing with the red man. It is a sad and pitiful story. I am dealing only with its folly.

Our relations with the little tribe of Seminoles have cost, according to Major Clarke's estimate, about one hundred millions of dollars since we acquired Florida. They were 5,500 all told, men, women, and children; about one thousand warriors. We made war upon



them twice, the first time because they obeyed the Divine mandate, "betray not him that wandereth," and would not surrender fugitive slaves. The first war lasted seven years. We put into it between thirty and forty thousand men, including over twenty thousand volunteers and militia. The maintenance of the volunteers cost us upward of fifteen millions, and of the regulars twenty-five millions more.

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to say to the honorable Senator that the Seminole Indians at that time were slave-owners, and when they received pay from the white settlers they appropriated it to purchase slaves for their own use.

Mr. HOAR. They would not give up the runaway slaves to their masters, whether they were slave-owners or not.

Mr. MORGAN. Because they kept them for their own use.

Mr. HOAR. We lost fifteen hundred and fifty officers and men, besides hundreds of white citizens who were killed. Sixteen years after we had hostilities again with the remnant of the tribe, which lasted more than three years, and cost several millions more.

The Sioux war of 1852 cost five millions. The Oregon war of 1853 cost ten millions. The war of 1862 with the Sioux in Minnesota cost twelve millions. In 1864-'65 we withdrew eight thousand Union soldiers from the South and sent them against the Cheyennes, who put two thousand warriors into the field. They were subdued at a cost of \$3,500,000. Less than twenty of them were killed, at a cost of \$175,000 apiece. For each Indian slain fifteen whites lost their lives.

I am informed by my colleague that the Commissioner of Pensions said that it would take \$32,000,000 to pension the soldiers engaged in Indian wars, which I have not included in my estimate.

September 30, 1866, General Sherman wrote from Fort Lyon, Colorado:

I do not see how we can make a decent excuse for an Indian war. I have traveled all the way from Laramie without a single soldier or escort. I met single men unarmed traveling along the road as in Missouri. Cattle and horses graze loose far from their owners, most tempting to a starving Indian; and though the Indians may easily make a descent upon those scattered ranches, yet they have not done so, and I see no external signs of fear of such an event.

The next year a war broke out with the friendly Cheyennes and Arapahoes, whose causes and cost I will state in the language of Hon. N. G. Taylor, Indian Commissioner, in his special report of July 12, 1867:

A careful examination has led me to the following conclusions:

First, that the tribes and parts of tribes involved in the war are the following, namely: As tribes, the northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, numbering about 180 lodges—say 300 warriors; the Minneconjoux band of the Teton Sioux Nation, 300 lodges, about 500 warriors; those of the Ogalalla band of Sioux who would not consent to cede the right of way for the Montana road via Powder River and the right to plant military posts in their country, 130 lodges, about 250 warriors; those of the Brulé band of Sioux who coincided with these Ogalallas in opposing the cession of the road and post privileges, some 150 lodges, about 300 warriors; those of the Two Kettle band of Sioux entertaining the same views, about 150 lodges, and some 300 warriors; making, in all, about 1,600 to 1,800 effective warriors.

These were the Indians who perpetrated the Phil. Kearney massacre and who have been carrying on the war in the north.

On the plains further south the only Indians known to be making hostile demonstrations are the Southern Cheyennes and Arapahoes, numbering some 200 lodges, and about 500 warriors, with possibly a few individuals from other tribes.

I am led to the conclusion, secondly, that the causes of the war are easily traced and readily understood when a few facts are known. These facts I proceed to cull from the official records.

In December, 1864, occurred the horrible Sand Creek massacre of friendly Cheyennes and Arapahoes in Colorado Territory. Exasperated and maddened by this cold-blooded butchery of their women and children, disarmed warriors, and old men, the remnant of these Indians sought the aid and protection of the Comanches and Kiowas, and obtained both. The combination which followed embraced all the tribes of the plains from the Red River of the South to the Red River of the North, and resulted in the general Indian war of 1865, which cost our people many valuable lives and \$40,000,000 in money. Peace was concluded with all the southern Indians in October, 1865.

From the facts before me, I conclude that we can have all we want from the Indians, and peace without war, if we so will, with entire security on all our frontiers, and in all our territorial domain, at a cost of less than two days' expenses of the existing war, to wit, a quarter of a million dollars, and in less than one hundred days.

I wish to say that I am reading these extracts not for the purpose of making any point on the righteousness or unrighteousness of our dealing with these Indians. The point I wish to make is simply the matter of dollars and cents, and I only read these other things where they are interwoven with the statements of the cost of the Indian wars.

But how shall peace be so easily and so soon made? Simply by retracing our wrong steps and by doing right. Pay the Northern Cheyennes and Arapahoes and the hostile Sioux for the trespass we have committed upon their recognized rights, and negotiate with them by fair treaty for the privilege of way and of military posts on their lands so far as we may need them. This is only doing them justice, as our established policy requires, and this makes them our friends at once, renders travel and transportation safe and garrisons almost useless. Restore to the Southern Cheyennes their village and their property we so wantonly and foolishly burned and destroyed, or pay them a fair price for them, and they will come back from the war-path and resume the avocations of peace.

It is believed that the destruction by our forces of the Cheyenne village and property, valued at \$100,000, in April last, has already cost the Government more than \$5,000,000 in money, one hundred lives of citizens and soldiers, and jeopardized all our material interests on the plains and along hundreds of miles of our frontier.

This war cost a trifle of forty millions. In 1866 we built forts on the Yellowstone and lands owned by the Sioux without gaining their consent. The war which followed cost ten millions.

The Navajo war, according to a careful estimate made by Mr. Loughridge, in the other House, cost twenty-five millions.

General Sherman said in 1866 that the Army service in New Mexico alone for the last twenty years had cost one hundred millions, the Army being employed most of the time solely in watching Indians.

In Arizona, General Ord in 1869 and General Schofield in 1871 estimate the Army service for watching Indians at three millions a year. Loughridge estimates this service in Arizona for fifteen years at thirty millions.

General Pope in his report of August 11, 1866, says:

Of all the powerful and populous tribes which once inhabited the Northwest but a few hundreds of hopeless and helpless stragglers remain. Of the history of the white settlers, the pioneers of emigration in the great States of the Northwest, it is unnecessary to speak. Such a record of nameless horrors, of gross inhumanity to whites and Indians, and of lavish and wasteful expenditure of public money, cannot at this day be read without astonishment and indignation. Such a process of extermination of both Indians and white men has never before been permitted to go on under the eyes of a Christian people, and it will long remain a reproach to this Government.

The Modoc war cost several millions and the life of Canby and one hundred and sixty men. Twelve Indians were killed.

Mr. Loughridge, in the same speech, declares that the cost of military operations alone against the Indians in the forty years ending 1874, had been \$500,000,000. Since that time we have to add to the bloody catalogue the wars with the Modocs, with the Sioux, the Nez Percés, the Bannocks, the Northern Cheyennes, the Utes, the Sheepeaters, and Apaches. The Secretary of War, in reply to a resolve of the Senate passed at the present session, in his letter of March 4, 1882, (Ex. Doc. No. 123,) gives the following tables of the number of officers and soldiers employed in each year for the past ten years in the observation and control of Indians, the cost of Indian wars in those years, and the cost to the Government during each of said years of so much of the Army as has been engaged in the observation and control of Indians, and whose presence has been rendered necessary as a protection from danger of Indian hostilities:

STATEMENT C.—Expenditures on account of Indian wars from 1872 to 1881.

| Period.  | War.                | Quartermaster's Department. | Subsistence Department. | Subsistence of Indian prisoners. | Stores lost. | Total.       |
|----------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1872-'73 | Modoc               | \$335,009 78                | \$183 35                |                                  |              | \$335,193 13 |
| 1875     | Texas               | 6,641 61                    |                         |                                  |              | 6,641 61     |
| 1875     | Texas               |                             | \$20,377 79             |                                  |              | 20,377 79    |
| 1876-'77 | Sioux               | 1,894,361 28                |                         | \$23,797 98                      |              | 1,918,159 26 |
| 1876-'77 | Sioux               |                             |                         | 5,967 59                         |              | 5,967 59     |
| 1877     | Nez Percés          | 975,082 65                  | 2,664 40                |                                  | 8,811 36     | 986,558 41   |
| 1877-'78 | Nez Percés          |                             |                         | 37,227 31                        |              | 37,227 31    |
| 1878     | Bannock             | 567,571 44                  | 537 49                  |                                  | 66 95        | 568,175 88   |
| 1878-'79 | Bannock             |                             |                         | 42,301 73                        |              | 42,301 73    |
| 1878-'79 | Northern Cheyennes. | 34,209 57                   |                         |                                  |              | 34,209 57    |
| 1879     | Ute                 | 1,192,682 89                |                         |                                  | 756 44       | 1,193,439 33 |
| 1879-'80 | Ute                 |                             |                         | 6,993 67                         |              | 6,993 67     |
| 1879     | Sheepeaters         | 9,411 86                    |                         |                                  |              | 9,411 86     |
| 1879     | Apache              | 43,850 00                   |                         |                                  |              | 43,850 00    |
| 1880-'81 | Apache              |                             |                         | 91,564 64                        |              | 91,564 64    |
|          |                     | 5,058,821 08                | 3,385 24                | 204,432 73                       | 33,432 73    | 5,300,071 78 |

STATEMENT F.

| Fiscal years. | Estimate by Adjutant-General of cost of troops in the Indian country, including annual average of appropriations for deficiencies expended wholly west of the Mississippi River. | Additional amount chargeable on appropriations for regular supplies and incidental expenses, transportation, purchase of horses, hire and construction of quarters, to make the proportion charged on these items 90 per cent. | Annual average of deficiency appropriations for items mentioned in the preceding column, calculated as therein. | Estimate submitted by the Secretary of War of the total cost of troops in the Indian country. |
|---------------|--|--|---|---|
| 1872-'73      | \$20,714,186 00  | \$2,069,040 00   | \$99,874 43   | \$22,883,100 43   |
| 1873-'74      | 23,106,001 04  | 1,955,005 00   | 99,874 43   | 25,160,880 47   |
| 1874-'75      | 20,825,070 00  | 1,895,500 00   | 99,874 43   | 22,820,444 43   |
| 1875-'76      | 19,800,088 00  | 2,401,875 00   | 99,874 43   | 22,301,837 43   |
| 1876-'77      | 17,940,416 00  | 2,227,750 00   | 99,874 43   | 20,268,040 43   |
| 1877-'78      | 20,074,145 00  | 1,400,000 00   | 99,874 43   | 21,574,019 43   |
| 1878-'79      | 19,858,151 00  | 1,444,500 00   | 99,874 43   | 21,402,525 43   |
| 1879-'80      | 21,343,151 00  | 1,251,796 00   | 99,874 43   | 22,694,821 43   |
| 1880-'81      | 21,087,618 60  | 1,271,952 00   | 99,874 43   | 22,459,444 43   |
| 1881-'82      | 20,725,933 00  | 1,500,343 20   | 99,874 43   | 22,326,150 63   |
| Total         | 205,474,759 00   | 17,417,761 20  | 998,744 30  | 223,891,264 50  |

It will be seen from these tables that the cost of Indian hostilities and of military protection against Indians for the last ten years is estimated by the Secretary of War, with the substantial concurrence of the General of the Army and the Adjutant-General, at \$223,891,264.50. The Interior Department, by letter of February 17, 1882, gives the amount expended for Indian subsistence and education during the last five years at \$22,342,385.44, (Ex. Doc. No. 113.) For the past ten years you would have nearly doubled said sum. This estimate does not include the sums appropriated by treaty or otherwise for the five civilized tribes. We shall clearly be far within the truth if we estimate the cost of Indian wars, military protection against Indians, and Indian subsistence for the past ten years at two hundred and sixty millions.

This period of ten years includes two of those covered by the estimates of Mr. Loughridge. Together they cover only forty-eight of the ninety-two years that have elapsed since the beginning of Washington's term. Making the proper deduction for the two overlapping years and adding to the remainder of the seven hundred and sixty millions the cost of Indian wars for the first forty-four years of our national existence the cost of Indian subsistence from 1789 to 1872, the sums paid to States and to volunteers, the property destroyed by Indians, and the effect on the value of property exposed to Indian hostilities, for the whole period of our history, and it will be admitted that the estimate of a thousand million dollars as the sum which the Indians have cost this country is within the truth.

We have tried in our Indian policy war and force and rapine and cruelty and treachery. The only experiment we have left untried is the experiment of simple justice.

I now, Mr. President, submit the tables furnished by the Secretary of the Interior, showing the amount for each of the past five years required to keep our treaty stipulations for the education of Indians. These promises are in large part the consideration for the Indian title to lands of great extent and value. The table contains the statistics for five years only. It shows that while we were bound by solemn promise to expend \$2,649,250, we have, in fact, expended but \$219,900. We are in arrears \$2,429,350. If this obligation had been to England we should not have fallen behind a day in its performance. The sum overdue for the last five years is more than is likely to be required for the next year to carry out the provisions of this bill. But we have been behindhand on an average more than twice that length of time.

TABLE 3.—Appropriations necessary to fulfill treaty stipulations in regard to education with certain tribes whose aggregate population is 68,076.

| Stipulations.  | 1877.     | 1878.   | 1879.   | 1880.   | 1881.   |
|--|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Amount required to erect school-houses in fulfillment of those treaties.....                     | \$334,000 |         |         |         |         |
| Appropriations required to support schools in fulfillment of those treaties.....                 | 486,000   | 486,000 | 486,000 | 486,000 | 371,250 |
| Amount specifically appropriated in fulfillment of educational provisions in those treaties..... | 44,880    | 48,080  | 46,580  | 46,280  | 34,080  |

\* This is a low estimate, and is for buildings (in addition to all those erected by 1881) which should have been built by 1877, in order to fulfill treaty provisions. Without such buildings the schools contemplated in the treaties could not be supported.

NOTE.—The decrease in 1881 is owing to the expiration of treaties with tribes in Washington Territory and Oregon.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs adds to this table these remarks:

Table 3 shows the appropriations which would have been required annually for the last five years to fulfill the educational provisions of treaties with certain tribes whose aggregate population is 68,076, or a little more than one-third of the whole Indian population of the United States, exclusive of the five civilized tribes. This table also shows the amounts which have been specifically appropriated in fulfillment of those treaty stipulations. How much, in addition to those sums, has been taken from other general funds and applied in support of schools among those tribes could not be ascertained without an expenditure of time and labor which would be unjustifiable in view of the inability of the present clerical force of this office to keep up with current work. But when it is observed, by a comparison of tables 2 and 3, that the amount required to fulfill treaty stipulations with these 68,000 Indians is more than is expended from all sources for all Indians, I think it will be sufficiently evident that the Government has broken its treaties on the very point where it would have been most to its own advantage, and in accordance with its own genius, to have kept them.

These figures are necessarily approximate, but are so carefully collated as to form a reliable basis for comparison and deduction, and though not covering all the ground will, I trust, answer the purpose contemplated in the resolution.

In general, I desire to say that where treaties have provided for the annual appropriation of a specified sum for education, those treaties have been fulfilled; but where they have specified that certain schools should be maintained, without specifying the sum which should annually be expended therefor, they have not been fulfilled. For instance, the Navajo treaty provided that a building should be erected, a teacher employed, and a school supported for every thirty children of school age in the tribe for ten years. The ten years expired in 1881, and the only appropriations ever made in fulfillment of that treaty provision have been \$2,000 per annum for salary of two teachers! From other funds the office has succeeded in erecting a boarding-school building, which will accommodate about seventy-five pupils. The tribe numbers 16,000! It is only similar cases which can be included in table 3. Treaties with other tribes in the country either provide for the appropriation of specific sums, which has been made, or made a general

provision for "education, civilization, agriculture," &c., or made no provision whatever for education.

I have the honor to be, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant.

H. PRICE, Commissioner.

The Commissioner, in his annual report for 1881, makes some interesting statements on this subject:

It becomes more evident with each year that the obstacle to the education of the Indian children of this generation lies not in their inability to be taught, nor in the indifference or hostility of the parents to education, but in meager appropriations. For the education of its 49,000 children of school age, in day and evening schools alone, the State of Rhode Island expends annually \$600,000. For the education of the same number of Indians (which is about the number to be provided for exclusive of the five civilized tribes in the Indian Territory) the United States Government last year appropriated, in fulfillment of specific treaty stipulations, \$64,000, and "for schools not otherwise provided for" \$75,000, making a total of \$139,000, with which to maintain day-schools, furnish books to all pupils, erect and furnish school-buildings, and support boarding-schools! From other funds appropriated for general civilization, but which can be applied to schools after other demands not more important but more immediately urgent have been met, the office has been able to expend about \$5,000. This, of course, has fallen so far short of meeting the needs of the service that requests for increased school accommodations at various agencies have repeatedly been refused.

For the current fiscal year an increase of \$10,000 was made by the last Congress, but this will hardly cover the increase in the cost of beef and flour consumed in the schools, to say nothing of maintaining new boarding-schools opened this fall in the new buildings before referred to, of supporting throughout the year schools opened near the close of the last fiscal year, and of erecting new buildings at hitherto neglected agencies. Consequently, requests for new boarding-school buildings at seven agencies and for needed enlargement of school buildings at five other agencies have already been refused, and unless a deficiency appropriation is made by Congress at its next regular session many Indian boarding-schools will have to be closed early next spring and the children remanded to the debasing surroundings from which the school was intended to redeem them.

It must not be supposed that by the appropriation of \$64,000, above referred to, treaty provisions with the various tribes have been fulfilled. This covers only specific sums called for by treaty. In the treaties of 1868, made with the Sioux, Navajo, Ute, Kiowa, Comanche, Cheyenne, Arapaho, Crow, Shoshone, and Pawnee tribes the educational provision is a general one, and is substantially as follows:

"In order to insure the civilization of the Indians entering into this treaty the necessity of education is admitted; especially of such of them as are or may be settled on said agricultural or other reservations, and they therefore pledge themselves to compel their children, male and female, between the ages of six and sixteen years to attend school, and the United States agrees that for every thirty children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school, a house shall be provided and a teacher competent to teach the elementary branches of an English education furnished, who will reside among said Indians and faithfully discharge his or her duties as teacher. The provisions of this article to continue for not less than twenty years."

These tribes number in the aggregate 60,000, and have at least 12,000 youths of school age. For these children the tables herewith show that after a lapse of thirteen years only twelve boarding and seven day schools have been provided, which will accommodate respectively 858 and 565 pupils. To furnish day-schools only, according to the treaties, for the remaining 10,000 youth would require the erection and furnishing of 250 school-houses at an average cost of not less than \$800 each, total, \$200,000, besides an annual expenditure of \$150,000 for salaries of 250 teachers at \$600 per annum, and \$80,000 for books, school appliances, &c., (at an average of \$8 per pupil,) or more than the entire amount expended during the past year at all agencies for both boarding and day schools. The shortsightedness and dishonesty of the policy hitherto pursued in this connection is beyond question.

As Lieutenant Pratt says, after making a similar estimate: "The injury done by the United States Government to this large number of Indian boys and girls who have grown up during this period by withholding this promised and valuable intelligence, and the actual injury and loss to the country from their having been an ignorant, pauper, peace-disturbing, life-destroying, impoverishing, instead of an intelligent, producing element, could not be stated in figures."

In 1875 the President appointed a very able commission, at the head of which was the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. ALLISON,] to treat with the Sioux for the Black Hills country. The report of the commission is full of interest. I call attention to its recommendations. The Senator from Iowa—and the preparation of this report will, in my judgment, be sometimes counted by him and by those who honor him as among the crowning services of a very distinguished public life—said:

Nearly seven years have passed away and these Indians are no nearer a condition of self-support than they were when the treaty was signed. And in the mean time the Government has expended nearly \$13,000,000 for their support. So that the future treatment of the Sioux becomes a matter of serious moment, if viewed from no higher standpoint than that of an economic question.

The purchase, lease, or occupation of the Black Hills by the whites is a mere incident to the great question, What shall be done with the Sioux people? It is said "As long as we feed them we will not be required to fight them." If this alternative is presented now, it will be fifty years hence if we continue to furnish them subsistence and take no steps to improve their condition, as we surely have not in the last six years. And if their numbers are increasing, as we believe, the amount to be annually expended will increase in like ratio. The commission is therefore of the opinion that Congress should act upon the whole question and devise a policy especially applicable to the Sioux nation within the spirit and letter of the treaty of 1868. This treaty contains two leading ideas and was intended to secure two purposes, namely, the education of the rising generation and the self-support of all the tribes. The former was made compulsory by the seventh article of the treaty, and nearly all of the remaining provisions, so far as the Indian is concerned, were intended to accomplish the latter by holding out to him inducements supposed to be ample to secure easy and rapid compliance. That this was intended and expected is clear, from the fact that the treaty only provided subsistence for four years at most. Congress can, under the letter of the treaty, provide most stringent laws for the education of those between six and sixteen.

The Government is pledged by the treaty to provide schools and teachers, and the Indians agree and "pledge themselves to compel their children, male and female, between the ages of six and sixteen years to attend school." The obligation is mutual and the power ample. Surely, if England and the German states, Hungary and Denmark, and the most enlightened of American States think it worth while to enact stringent laws to enforce the attendance of the youths at the common schools, our Government, when it has the power, should, by stringent laws faithfully enforced, make the experiment which it is pledged to make by the treaty of 1868. The common school in the several States of the Union is supported by taxation of property. Iowa taxes her people \$4,000,000 annually, and Massachusetts, with about the same population, \$6,000,000 annually to support free schools. The State of New York has expended in the last twelve years for public school purposes \$110,000,000 raised by taxation.



These enormous sums are levied upon the property of the people on the theory that universal education is essential to the welfare of the State. These Indians are within the territorial limits of the United States and subject to their authority, and cannot be removed out of that jurisdiction. Education to them is essential if they are to be reclaimed from semi-barbarism, and it concerns the whole people of the United States. We now supply all the children of the Sioux Nation between the ages of six and sixteen years with food and clothing, and with better food than is enjoyed by a very large portion of the laborers of the country, and expend as much per capita for clothing as is expended by many of our laborers, so that the only additional expense in educating them would be the employment of competent teachers and the necessary expense of buildings for school purposes. These schools ought to be established at points not accessible to the adult Indians, for instruction in the elementary branches of English as usually taught in our primary schools, and should also embrace instruction in the rudimentary employments, such as are taught in manual-labor schools for boys and industrial schools for girls. It might be difficult to separate the younger children from their parents, and an attempt so to do might meet with serious opposition, so that at first those in charge should select, with the consent of parents, the brightest and most promising youths for such schools. And in the mean time other schools of like character, with stringent rules for their government, should be established in the neighborhood of the agencies, but wholly separated from them. In this way the Indians would very soon realize the benefits to be derived, and further separation would be less difficult.

The Commissioner of Education estimates that there are 10,217,825 children in the United States between the ages of six and sixteen years, or about one-fourth of the whole population. Assuming that about the same ratio prevails in the Sioux tribes, there are now on the Sioux reservation 8,000 children who are growing up in barbarism, not 200 of whom have ever received any instruction whatever; and these children are not decreasing in numbers. An actual count of the Indians at Yankton agency was made in 1859, report of which is found in Indian Report of that year. This count shows, men, 440; women, 632; boys, 473; girls, 427, and about 150 absent; which shows the ratio of children to be not less than above estimated. If this condition is to continue, how long will the people of the United States be taxed to support the Sioux nation? If the Government shall enter upon the work in earnest, these labor schools could be established in a mild climate and productive country, and could soon be made self-sustaining; but the power of force, mildly exercised, must be invoked in the beginning. To rely upon voluntary attendance is futile. This has been tried for two hundred years, and has rarely been a success among the wilder tribes of Indians. This experiment may not be, but should be attempted gradually, and upon a well-matured plan, prepared by eminent teachers. It may be said that this experiment will make large drafts upon the Treasury. This need not be so. As stated before, these children are now clothed and subsisted; or, rather, money is expended to clothe and subsist them. All above twelve years of age could, if well directed, very soon be made to earn their own subsistence and enough to supply food to all attending school, and, in time, to do very much toward providing their own clothing. The latter, if successful, would relieve the Government from clothing them for thirty years, as required by the treaty. Besides, the experiment could be tried in such a gradual way as that, if failure should follow, it need not be pursued. Or, if it shall prove too expensive, it could at any time be abandoned by Congress. This method is suggested for consideration. If a better can be found, it should be adopted. It seems to the commission that education, as here suggested, or by some effectual method, is the first step toward the civilization of these tribes. Religious missionaries or sectarian schools are useful as adjuncts, or may follow; but a complete system of education, embracing all the children, is the first requisite. Some comprehensive system of education for the Sioux nation should be established, or all attempts to educate and civilize them might as well be abandoned.

At Red Cloud there are four companies of infantry and two of cavalry; at Spotted Tail three of infantry and one of cavalry; a post at Fort Laramie contiguous to the reservation, and a small force at each of the other agencies, all made necessary by the conduct of the Indians, and all requiring great expense for their maintenance, except those on the Missouri River, on account of the distance from cheap transportation. Now they ask that the Government shall use this military force, not only to preserve order and protect property at the agencies, but also that it shall be used against citizens of the United States who choose to violate law and treaty obligations, and who in addition take the risks of conflict with the Indians for the shadowy prospect of gold in the Black Hills!

Mr. President, I believe that in ten years, perhaps in five, the Indian problem could be settled, and much more than the sum expended for education saved from other expenditures. Whenever the children of a tribe can be put at school the peaceable behavior of that tribe is secure. The sum expended for Indian subsistence is expended for children as well as for adults. Of course so much of the cost of rations furnished any tribe as now goes to the support of children of school age would be more economically used in the mode now proposed than in the present wasteful method.

The average cost per capita of the rations now issued to the Indians supported by the Government is about sixty dollars. This is an indefinite and, under our present policies, will be a perpetual burden. If instead of this you increase the sum to \$167.50 for five or six years and make the Indian self-supporting, it requires little arithmetic to show the gain by the transaction.

The sum we now owe the Indians for education under express treaty stipulations is more than is needed at present.

The partial experiments made in the past have been made under great disadvantages. It is easy to see the reasons why Indian education has not been more effective hitherto. A few boys have been taken from a savage tribe and returned still in early youth to dwell in a savage community. It is not strange that what would bring ruin to your child or mine should bring it still more surely to the child of the Indian.

Few Indian girls have been sent to civilized schools. The girl, when marriageable, is regarded by her parents, in most tribes, as valuable property to be sold to her husband. They have been unwilling to spare them for education in the white man's ways. You cannot hope to completely civilize the children while the mothers are savage. The nomadic habit of the Indian has been an obstacle, but now they are becoming corralled in; they are learning more and more their own weakness and our strength; they see that the game is disappearing; they are learning something of the advantage of civilization. Those who are engaged in Indian education agree in the

belief that we shall hereafter have no difficulty in obtaining all the Indian children for whom we will consent to provide an education.

Consider also the protection against Indian wars which will be afforded by the custody for purposes of education of a large portion of the children of the tribes. It seems to me that the responsibility for future Indian cruelties and crimes must rest largely upon Congress if it refuse to pursue this simple and easy policy. These people are savages, and in future as in the past will conduct as savages if in despite of the teaching of experience we keep them savages.

The various bands who may be properly classed under the general name of Sioux are estimated by Mr. ALLISON at a little more than 41,000 in number. This bill appropriates for them \$1,962,300. It shows that they are rapidly increasing in number. We are bound by treaty to educate their entire school population. We break this covenant, and keep this powerful band of savages a perpetual terror and menace to our new States and Territories. The Commonwealth which I represent must pay twenty, perhaps fifty, fold of the tax which it will require to keep our treaty stipulations compared with that to be paid by any State or Territory whose people are directly affected. She will gladly pay it if you will but make trial of this experiment.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, so far as the financial part of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] is concerned, I have only to observe that the Army goes on, like Tennyson's brook, whether there be a war or not. It will probably never be less than 25,000 soldiers. It has not been more except in the case of the civil war. It is not fair to charge the country with the support of the Army on account of Indian wars, when that support will go on, whether we are at war or whether we are at peace. I think, therefore, that the larger portion of the estimate of the financial consequence of our Indian policy drops out.

I am not going to deny either the obligations of humanity or the obligations of treaty toward the Indians, and I regret that in the summary which the Senator from Massachusetts has made, and which is going to be largely accepted as authority, he started so late. Some time since the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. VEST.] in discussing another subject, remarked that the victors would write the history of the war in which their victory had been won; and I recognize the fact that the eastern people are going to most largely write the history of this Indian controversy. I regret, therefore, that the Senator from Massachusetts, who has contributed his portion of that history, should not have gone back of 1789, and that when he arraigned the American people and the American Government for its injustice, and for its tardy justice and for its improvidence, he did not go back to the history of the Massachusetts colony.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator understand that the people whose history I have stated for the last sixty years is not my own people?

Mr. PLUMB. I do not know about their being his own people, but he might have gone a little nearer home if he had been so minded; and I am reminded in the same connection that about a year ago a book was published which was entitled "A Century of Dishonor." It purported to be an account of the nation's dealing with the Indians during the last hundred years and was written by a Massachusetts lady. The work was well done, and I do not mention it to dispute the allegations it contained, but like the speech of the Massachusetts Senator, and unfortunately, as I think, it began too late to give a complete history of dealings with the Indians on this continent. It did not take into account at all the treatment of the Indians by the New England people. I have before me Mr. Palfrey's History of New England, from which I read on page 221 the following poetical account of the disposal of the captives of the war with Philip:

Of the two hundred prisoners taken by Waldron at Dover, and sent to Boston under the charge of having violated the treaty of peace, seven, who, in pursuance of that perfidy, were ascertained to have taken life, were executed; the rest were sent to Bermuda to be there sold.

There is one thing to be said in favor of the western people: they never sold any of the Indians into slavery; they never profited in their pockets by Indian hostilities, at least in that way.

And this latter—

Quoting now from Palfrey—

is said to have been the fate of Philip's son. It was a shocking way of disposing of the conquered barbarians. The selling of man, woman, or child to be a slave is a horrible act, though there was nothing to give it peculiar aggravation in the circumstance that one of the sufferers was Philip's son.

I do not speak of that for the purpose of arraigning the people of New England, but for the purpose of showing that an important part of the history of the dealings of the American people with Indian tribes has been omitted, and a part, too, of importance in the general summary. In summing up the expense that has attended the extinction of Indian tribes on this continent, not a dollar has been added on account of the expenses incurred by the Massachusetts colony in completely wiping out the tribes within its limits. There are to-day perhaps five hundred or one thousand Indians left of all those who once occupied the eastern coast, and they are located in the States of Massachusetts and Maine. The cost of exterminating the powerful tribes whom the Pilgrim fathers encountered, and robbing them of their territory, the selling of them into slavery, is not exhibited by way of example to show how much cheaper it is to feed and educate the Indian than it is to fight him. Everything is charged up on the

transactions west of the Alleghanies, and occurring within the last century.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts by way of explanation says that the people who have done what he complains of are his people; that they represent the same blood which he represents; and that is true. The blood of New England has gone across the Alleghanies and throughout the whole West and Northwest, fertilizing and enriching the population, and impressing upon institutions and people its own peculiar characteristics. The State I in part represent is the debtor of New England in all their ways. But when the Senator comes to sum up the responsibility for what he calls the improvidences of the Government and the outrages on the Indian tribes, he conveniently omits any statement of the responsibility which attaches to the immediate section of country which he represents. It is not perhaps material to a proper consideration of this question whether the responsibility be East or whether it be West, but it is worth while, now that the country is entering upon a new phase of the Indian question, that those of us who live West and who have been held up as the type of the aggressive, of the implacable, and of the brutal and revengeful element which has entered into this controversy on the white side, should not be charged with what we are not guilty of.

Mr. President, the history of that controversy is simply the history of a struggle for race supremacy. The white race was contending with the red race for the mastery, and with the inevitable result, as we believe, foreordained from the beginning, that the red race shall give way. I quote from an honored son of Massachusetts now living when I say that the red race is a provisional one. The Indian, according to this theory, is not designed to improve, and increase, and fill the land, but simply to make things ready for the Anglo-Saxon; and the people who landed at Plymouth Rock and at other places on that bleak coast acted on that principle long before Mr. Holmes spoke, and when he said the red was a provisional race he spoke of a race that had already been destroyed by his own people.

Mr. President, I am not going to deny, as I said in the outset, the obligations of humanity. By just as much as these people are dependent, by just that much our obligation is augmented. We are bound to do for them all that we are bound to do for any people who are wholly dependent. Independent, however, of treaty agreement, our obligation to the Indians is nothing as compared with that we are under to the blacks. Here are 4,000,000 people brought here for commercial reasons and who have been emancipated, and upon whom the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship have been thrust and who are not qualified properly to exercise those obligations and responsibilities, because the Government has not done for them that which the Senator from Massachusetts so eloquently argues ought to be done for the Indian. If we are to consider simply the obligations of humanity, the obligations to society, the obligations to the present and the obligations to the future, independent of contract, our duty is a thousandfold stronger in favor of the black in the Southern States than it is in favor of the Indian.

A common charge, repeated by the Senator from Massachusetts, is that the Government does not carry out its treaty obligations with the Indians, and this is especially alleged to be the case in the matter of education. It is true, as the Senator says, that when we consider the letter of many of the treaties, and compare the number of children of school age in the various tribes with the number actually provided with facilities for education, there is an apparent failure to comply with treaty obligations. But there are two sides to this question. Take the Navajo Indians that the Senator quoted, for instance. The treaty provides that the Government shall provide a teacher and school-house for every thirty children of the school age. The idea in view when the treaty was made undoubtedly was that the Navajo Indians would form small and separate communities, as white people do, and that there would be here a little settlement and there a little settlement, and that where there was a settlement embracing thirty children there should be a school-house on an adjacent hill, with of course a teacher.

But the Navajo Indians did not settle down in that way, and they never called on us for the fulfillment of that obligation. The maximum number of children they have ever furnished to the school established on their reservation is about one hundred and thirty out of over sixteen thousand souls comprising the tribe. They have manifested but little willingness whatever to receive the benefits of the education we obligated ourselves to furnish them; and while the treaty seemed to contemplate compelling the Indians to send their children to school, the Government has, wisely, I think, refrained from using compulsion, and the result has been, on the whole, favorable; more so, I think, than would have occurred if the opposite policy had been pursued.

In 1868 the Navajo Indians were located upon a reservation in the neighborhood of Fort Stanton, New Mexico, a reservation remote from the territory which they had before that time occupied, and one to which they had been removed by force. Under treaty they were taken to the place where they now are on the borders of Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. By virtue of the provisions of that treaty they were given in 1869 15,000 head of sheep and 1,000 goats. About four years later they were given 10,000 head more of sheep, and what is the result? Their sheep and goats have increased

until they number 1,250,000. They have besides about 40,000 horses and a large amount of other stock. They have not the number of educated children the people of Massachusetts have in proportion to their population, but they are self-supporting, and have been for the last two or three years. They roam over a large extent of country, taking with them their families and their flocks and herds, and only a small number are ever found near their agency. They have not desired that any considerable number of their children should be educated, but they assiduously devoted themselves to the acquisition of the means of support. The potential part of the treaty with them was the stock they acquired, and not the provision for the education of their children.

Now, if there is any one here or elsewhere who begrudges these Indians this independence and regrets that the Government did not bring them within the limits of a comparatively small reservation and did not compel them to give up their children to be educated, and therefore bring them under conditions where the Government would have been compelled to support them, all I have to say is that his notion and mine of the proper result to be attained are wide apart. These Navajos support themselves. They are indifferent no doubt to the benefits of education; they do not care much about the other civilizing influences except so far as they relate to the acquisition of property; but that burden which was cast on the Government prior to the treaty of 1868 and for ten years after has been entirely removed so far as the support of this tribe is concerned, to the great saving of money to the Government and to the great advantage of the Indians, who have redeemed themselves from pauperism, and by that fact have greatly advanced in the scale of civilization—far more, I think, than they would have done if they had submitted to education under circumstances which would have prevented them from becoming self-supporting.

A few years ago the Government moved from their reservation to the Indian Territory the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians. The Kiowa and Comanche and other Indians were also moved there, and with what result? They were not given stock, but they were encouraged to try farming, after the style of the white man, and a systematic effort has been made to educate their children. No doubt the process of education has been attended with some success, but the tribes are not only not self-supporting, but they require increasing sums each year for their support. In this case the process applied to the Navajos was reversed, and the experiment of civilization begun in the wrong way.

My idea is that the first step in the civilization of the Indian is to make him self-supporting; and the chief obligation of the Government is to put him in this condition. Why? Solely and only for the reason that we have had an agency in removing from them the opportunity for supporting themselves by the destruction of the game upon which they had heretofore lived. We have taken away that means of support. The progress of white settlement has brought this about, and an obligation results to put them in a condition to meet the new order of things.

The money that we have donated to the Indians, including the tribes I have named, for the purpose of support far exceeds the cost of all the education we promised them. We are making an actual donation to the Cheyenne and Arapaho and Kiowa and Comanche Indians of \$400,000 per annum beyond treaty obligations. This would far more than educate all the children of these tribes. Besides we have supplied means of education with a not illiberal hand and nearly if not quite up to the desire of the Indians themselves. Having the choice it has been wisely exercised, I think, in feeding them rather than furnishing them more education and less food. It has kept the peace, has to some extent tamed them, and made a foundation on which better things can be built hereafter. They have not been specially clamorous about increased facilities for education; in fact they come slowly to an appreciation of its advantages, except as they see in it present food and raiment, for every child while in school gets full rations and is well clothed.

Without the food and the clothing that is the inevitable accompaniment of the child in school, you would get very few Indian children into school. Education is a good thing for Indians as well as for whites, but the number of Indians who have been rendered self-supporting by education during the last ten years is very small indeed. It will instruct the Senator from Massachusetts to read the reports from the various Indian agencies on this point.

It will not do to educate the Indian simply for the fun of the thing. It should be for the purpose of putting him beyond pauperism, to take him off the hands of the Government. When we have brought this about we have accomplished all the Government should undertake.

Why educate them more than we educate the black people in the Southern States, to whom we are under more obligations? The purpose of all this education ought to be to put these people upon a self-supporting basis; and I say now, not as something new, but as uttering a truism, that the only education that amounts to anything is that which enables a man to be self-supporting, and which is accompanied by a proper idea of the results of labor. When you have put an Indian, or a white man, or any one else in a position to earn his living you have laid the foundation for education, because you have quickened his perceptions by the suggestion of self-interest.

The trouble about our Indian policy is just this: we feed the



Indians; we do not compel them to labor; we support them in idleness; and the longer this goes on the worse the Indian is off. He does not appreciate any more than a white man that which costs nothing. If we cut down his ration he threatens to fight, and we put it back, and, realizing his power, he counts on being always able to live an indolent life.

Now, the Senator from Massachusetts says if we will only educate them we shall not have to fight them; but if we educate them we have got to feed them at the same time and afterward as well; for education as a means to self-support on the part of the Indian has so far been barren of results.

Is it not better to commence at the other end and learn them first to support themselves, or at least to put the two together, giving the preference on the whole to that which more directly tends to self-support?

Mr. President, the report from which the Senator from Massachusetts read of the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a gentleman for whom I have very high respect, contained in one paragraph a statement of the vice of this whole proceeding. In a brief and sententious expression which he uses he states the whole trouble:

But so long as the American people now demand that Indians shall become white men within one generation, the Indian child must have other opportunities and come under other influences than reservations can offer.

That states the whole case. We want the Indian to do in one generation what the white race has been twenty generations in doing. We are not willing to have him commence where we did and come up through regular gradations of improvement, but he is to be forced up on to our plane at a jump. This occasions much of the trouble we are constantly confronted with. The Indian is a nomad. He cannot be brought into close quarters at once to advantage. He must come by degrees. He is better fitted for herding than to till the soil or engage in the mechanic arts. He wants stock—herds of cattle and sheep—and he wants them a great deal more than he wants the Greek root or the differential calculus.

And, Mr. President, when we commence that as we have with the Navajoes, when we give to the Comanches, to the Cheyennes, to the Arapahoes, to the Sioux the means of supporting themselves in a way which is related to their natural mode of life and which they are perfectly competent to do, we shall have laid the foundation for an education that will not only make them self-supporting, but will in time bring fruit of a kind which the Senator from Massachusetts wants, but which he never can get upon the basis upon which he is proceeding. The Indian problem is to remain so long as present methods continue. It is the same to-day that it was yesterday, and to-morrow we shall be confronted with it, and so on.

Mr. HOAR. How long?

Mr. PLUMB. Until the Indian disappears, unless we change our policy.

As I said, there remains the obligation of humanity. To that I respond as fully as anybody, and whatever amount of money is necessary to meet this obligation should be appropriated. But it should be so used as not to damage the recipients, as it will do if it encourages idleness. The first thing, then, is to learn the Indian to labor, and in order to do this he must be enabled to see the fruits of labor.

The Indians who are educated at Carlisle Barracks cannot support themselves in competition with white labor. They are imitative and do much work well under instruction, but they could not cut loose and do for themselves. It takes more than mere ability to put so many pegs into a shoe in so many minutes to make a person fit for the active competitions of life. It takes mental and physical fiber, self-reliance coming of race, of birth, of training. In the Anglo-Saxon this is the product of generations of development. The Indian will not acquire it in one, and it is not to his discredit to say so. There are many things he can do. He can be made useful and self-supporting if he is given congenial employment in the line of his habits, of his training, of his instincts, and when he has been brought to the condition of self-support the obligation of the Government toward him has been discharged. As I said before, this will come best only by beginning at the beginning—with stock, with the most rudimentary agriculture, and the education which the Senator from Massachusetts desires can only come in connection with or after this.

The Government has fairly observed its obligations to the Indian so far as they are fixed by treaty stipulation. It has done more than that; it has been liberal. In the very bill now under consideration there is more than \$1,000,000 given beyond treaty obligation, given as charity, given as charity to people whom to great extent it is pauperizing by that charity, too.

There has been a good deal of talk about lands in severalty, about the civilizing influence of giving an Indian one hundred and sixty acres of land and compelling him to live on it; and at this very session of Congress there has been a delegation here from the six tribes of New York protesting against having their lands allotted in that way. They live there surrounded by the civilization of that Empire State; their land is traversed by railroads; it is fertile and valuable.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator does not wish to misrepresent those Indians. They base their protest entirely on their title; that they would lose their title if their land was parceled out to them in severalty, as I understand.

Mr. TELLER. Why?

Mr. DAWES. Because they hold their title under special provisions in their grant, which it was the opinion of their attorney, in which the Committee on Indian Affairs agreed, that they would forfeit their title unless they held it in a particular way.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose the Senator will not deny that even in the civilized tribes in the State of New York there is a great objection to holding lands in severalty.

Mr. DAWES. That may be; but they were here for the purpose of satisfying the Committee on Indian Affairs that they cannot obtain a title to their land in severalty under the grant which they have, not from the Government of the United States, but under a purchase from some of those Holland companies of some character or other which once held such a large part of Western New York. That was the ground.

Mr. PLUMB. Well, Mr. President, the Senator will remember that he presented a petition from the Caddoes the other day to the same effect. Was that put on the same ground?

Mr. DAWES. I admit that the Indians in the Indian Territory to which the Senator alludes shrink from the idea of land in severalty.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not say that land in severalty may not be a good thing for certain Indians, but it is not equally good for all. Some can stand it and some cannot. But it is not a panacea. The changes it will bring must come by degrees in order not to do damage. Such Indians as are able to stand alone must be first allowed to try it and others come to it by force of the example. But in many cases, if applied to tribes, it will deprive the weak of the help of the strong, and possibly prevent the introduction of herds of cattle and sheep by which chiefly the Indian is to be enabled to take care of himself.

The protests of the New York and other Indians who have lived for generations in contact with the whites shows how reluctantly the Indian gives up his habits of life and how determined he is not to yield to innovation. The process of adaptation is slow with him.

Those of us who live near to the Indian are greatly interested in this problem. The burden is ours. If the Indian is a pauper or a criminal the community in which or adjoining which he is located must suffer in consequence. We want them to be self-supporting first; we want that to precede everything else. We want the Government to say that by just as much as it has the power it will put the Indian in condition to live by his own labor, and we want him taken off the shoulders of the Government as early as possible, not because of the money it costs, because that is the smallest consideration, but because we want that example applied to them which is applied to everybody else; we want every man to earn his living by the sweat of his brow, and we do not want a distinction made between the Indian and the black, or between the Indian and the white. We are interested in this problem more than anybody else.

The Indian is to be civilized by labor, but he ought to be Christianized as well. The Government is a machine. It sends out an agent for a particular purpose. He may not always be the best man to civilize and humanize the Indians. Year after year the various Christian denominations of this country take up great contributions for foreign missions. They are interested in civilizing Japan and China; they are interested in furnishing flannel clothes to the inhabitants of the torrid regions, and in every way the charity of the people is invoked in favor of races who live on other continents.

Here now are 250,000 or 300,000 Indian people, many of them objects of charity, and all needing religious instruction; needing education of some sort; to be taken by the hand of sympathy and shown the better way. Why do not the sympathy, the good-will, the humanity, the religious zeal of all these organizations go out to these people? Why are not the operations of the Government more largely supplemented by the operations of the religious organizations of the country? This aid ought to be more effectively given than ever heretofore, and if given with zeal and good-will, important results would follow.

As I have before said, any one who looks over this bill will find that the Government has dealt with great liberality with every Indian tribe. It is paying a million dollars over and above all treaty obligations. It paid last year, according to the estimate of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, about four hundred thousand dollars for educational purposes alone. Perhaps that was not all wisely expended, but I think if any one will read the reports of the various agents—

Mr. DAWES. For the support of schools for the year ending June 30, 1881, \$208,996.47 is the amount reported.

Mr. PLUMB. I am very sorry to correct my friend from Massachusetts, but I read from the statement furnished by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in which he says:

Total expenditure for education for 1881, \$379,288.

Mr. DAWES. I read from the tabular statement of "disbursements made from appropriations for the Indian Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1881," and I read from the table just as I have read, and under the head "support of schools"—

Mr. PLUMB. When the doctors differ I do not know what we shall do; but I have here the letter of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of date of February 17, 1882, which is tolerably late, in which he puts the total expenditure for education for the fiscal year 1881 at \$379,288. That was exclusive of the sums used for similar purposes in the civilized tribes.

Mr. DAWES. I have the appropriation bill of last year before me, and the sum total of everything that is appropriated for the Indian service for that year; and I have a table here which shows where every dollar of it went, and there is no head that has any reference to education but the one I have read; all the rest of it comes under different heads.

Mr. PLUMB. The quarrel of the Senator is with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and not with me. I do not care to swap tables with the Senator from Massachusetts, but I have given him the statement as it is published in this Executive Document No. 113.

Now, Mr. President, I say the Government has fairly responded to its obligations to educate the Indian. It has educated substantially all the Indian children which the Indian tribes desired to have educated, and it has made, I think, a somewhat improvident use of the money it has otherwise used for their benefit, and we have got to have, I admit, considerable of a renovation of our Indian system in order to put the Indians on a self-supporting basis.

The experiment with the Navajo Indians shows what can be done. I think the Senator from Massachusetts who reports this bill will agree with me that if the Navajos had had more education of the kind usually supplied they would have had less sheep.

The evidence before the sub-committee was to the effect that the goods distributed at the agency were an element of demoralization; that the 5 or 10 per cent. of the tribe who got those goods staid around the agency away from their flocks and herds for three or four weeks, getting drunk, raising disturbances, doing no good, and finally ended by swapping off their annuity goods to the adjacent Mexicans for whisky, while the Indians who did not come in for goods, but who were off in the little valleys taking care of their flocks and herds, give the Government no concern and do not care whether there is a Government or not, because they have with their own exertions amply supplied themselves with all the necessities and many of the luxuries of life, and are constantly increasing in wealth.

Something has been said about teaching the Indians to manufacture. The Navajo Indians, without any instruction, with no inducement except self-interest, have become the manufacturers not only of blankets but of hosiery, of shirts, of stockings, and various other articles of wear, and they sell these articles at high prices on account of their superior quality. This manufacturing they have taken up because it is related to their main occupation, that of raising wool. They are reported to keep on hand large supplies of the goods of their manufacture, and sell as much as a quarter of a million dollars' worth each year.

How much better would the Navajo Indians be to-day if they had been brought close around Fort Defiance and been fed day by day since 1868? If every child had been put to school and kept there at the expense of the Government, would he have been more than self-supporting? Could he more than have fed and clothed himself? That is what he is doing now.

To begin with the education of the school-house is to begin at the wrong end. Begin at the bottom, put these people in a condition to be self-supporting, sharpen their faculties by acquisition, by self-interest. If they want luxuries either of education or anything else, let them feel stimulated to get them by their own exertions; what they will then learn will be of lasting value to them.

The report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on this question of the obligation of the Government is, as I think, misleading. While I confess, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] did the other day, that I accord to the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs not only ability but a conscientious desire to discharge his duty, he has taken the nominal obligations of the Government, not its actual ones, in making up his statement. There is no obligation to educate the Navajo children that has not been responded to, because the Navajo has not wanted all the education named in the treaty. This is equally true of other tribes. It takes time to get them ready. It takes experience to tell what and how best to teach. A large sum of money appropriated now will likely be squandered, and the amount provided in this bill seems ample for all practical purposes, all that can be profitably spent.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not exactly know—it may be from a want of apprehension on my part—what to make of the speech of the honorable Senator from Kansas, [Mr. PLUMB.] I have not uttered to-day a word in regard to the conduct of any Western community, of any Western man, of any Western State. I have not undertaken to refer to any Western opinion. I undertook to make this argument, that since the organization of the Government, the only national Government we have had in this country, we had expended a thousand millions of dollars in a particular way, and that we were likely to go on in that way forever, and that by expending a half million of dollars annually in another way we could save the whole of it; and in establishing that proposition I had to read from official reports in one or two instances, one especial instance from an official report made by a very eminent statesman, now a Senator on this floor from a Western State, in which there were mixed certain statements that the treatment of the Government had been cruel or unfaithful, or something of that kind. I said that I only read them because I could not read the sentences in which they were contained without them, and thereupon the honorable Senator from Kansas seems to be put into a state of mind in which he finds some comfort

in saying that my ancestors two hundred or two hundred and fifty years ago in Massachusetts did not treat their Indians well.

I have noticed that anybody who wants to defend an old abuse, or who wants to bring down the manners and habits of the fifteenth or the sixteenth century into the nineteenth, or anybody who has been caught in some act of dishonor or of oppression or of cruelty or of breach of faith—this last part of my utterance does not in the least refer to the honorable Senator from Kansas—seems to take great comfort in referring to the early Puritan history of Massachusetts; and if by any possibility that generation which came across the Atlantic out of a realm where men were burnt at the stake for religious opinions, where the rich oppressed the poor, where people had not learned the iniquity of slavery or of oppression, or servitude, retained any of the taint which they brought with them, it is a great comfort to anybody who has got to make a speech in favor of any abuse now. Well, let the comfort be enjoyed by everybody who chooses to consider it a comfort.

The Senator from Kansas thinks I ought to have added to the statement of the cost to our Government of a policy which I think is a bad one and which, if I understand him aright, he thinks is a bad one, a statement of the conduct of Massachusetts in treating her Indians prior to 1650. Well, now, I cannot see, I do not see how that could have helped this consideration. Does the Senator mean to carry the doctrine of total depravity so far as to claim that because of some misconduct of my ancestors, which he made out when he alluded to it before by taking about half a sentence of the historian and leaving off the rest of it, so as to change its meaning—I refer to his former reading of Palfrey's history in another debate of this kind—I am not entitled to my view as a Senator of the United States on a question I have got to vote on; or that so long as the Constitution of the United States gives every State two Senators that is any State of this Union that has not the right to express its opinion?

Mr. PLUMB. Not only do I not hold that, but I hold not only that the Senator has a perfect right to vote on this question, but that he had a perfect right to commence his history of Indian wrongs just after Massachusetts had got rid of all its Indians.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I did not make any history of Indian wrongs, and the Senator knows enough to know that he ought not to say it. I undertook to state, from the official documents, the cost of something in dollars and cents, and I began forty years after the organization of this Government, and in that way only made a general estimate. I have not made any history of Indian wrongs at all, and I say again that in the speech which I prepared there is not one solitary word that alludes to any act for which the people of Massachusetts are not as thoroughly responsible as the people of Kansas or of Colorado.

Mr. PLUMB. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. I do not yield; I propose to complete what I have to say. They are twenty times as responsible, because Kansas and Colorado are young States, whose Representatives have had nothing to do with the Indian policy which, under the law, the Government of the United States has pursued. I did not state that anybody had been to blame except by a foolish expenditure of money—not a word. I cited Western authority with high commendation. That was all I said about any Western person, and I repeat that if anything I said can be taken to be an imputation of wrong to anybody, and not simply of mistaken policy, it rests wholly on my State and not at all on the State which the Senator represents, because my State has been in existence all the time to take a share in these things, and his State did not come into the Union until within a very few years.

Now by what right does the Senator assume to divest himself or the Senate from the true issue here by undertaking to revive this old and wretched State jealousy and get up a quarrel? I spoke of the committee; I prefaced what I had to say by expressing my delight at the liberal and wise policy, which I understood the honorable Senator from Kansas concurred in as a member of this committee, that it had reported a provision which seemed to me to involve the principle which I advocated; and I addressed my argument to supporting what I understood to be the opinion of that committee and to giving some reasons which I thought should properly induce the Senate to go further.

Now, I do not understand that the Senator from Kansas, when you come to get at the point of speech which he has made, differs from me in opinion. He thinks the religious bodies in Massachusetts or elsewhere in the country have not done enough for Indian civilization and education. They have done a great deal. They have their agents in most of the Indian tribes. The history of the five nations who have become civilized and self-supporting rests upon the contribution and the effort and the direction, very largely, of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions. I have no personal right to speak for the labors of that great charitable body. The denomination of Christians to which I belong I suppose would not be admitted to membership in its ranks; but I respect and honor, as among the treasures of American history, the great charitable work of that organization and of its present associate, the American Missionary Association, both of whom have contributed to the extent of the ability of their members to this and other public charities, domestic as well as foreign.

The Senator says just what I said, that our present Indian policy



is to keep the Indian problem perpetually with us, and on my asking him how long, he says until the Indian perishes or is exterminated. If the statistics of Major Powell, Colonel Mallery, and Major Clarke are right, the Indians are increasing and not diminishing, so that this fire of Indian hatred is to burn until the eternal doom is reached.

The Senator agrees with me in that. He also agrees that so far as is practicable the Government should provide for the education of the Indian. But he says that you cannot get all the Indians; they will not consent, and that it is not politic to force them. I have not suggested that it is. My proposition is that instead of limiting it to a gross sum like \$50,000, the President of the United States should have at his disposal a sum of \$200 a year for every Indian child who can in his discretion be profitably educated. My opinion is and it is the view of persons whose opinion is a great deal better than mine, that if there are Indians now ready for such education, in five or ten years the Indian tribes will be civilized and the Indian problem removed, and the Indians become entirely self-supporting.

The honorable Senator says that he would rather have the Indians taught to be manufacturers of woollens or of blankets, or herdsmen, than to learn the Greek root. Well, the first suggestion of teaching an Indian the Greek root that I ever heard of has come from the Senator from Kansas. The proposition is to educate them in precisely the things in which he agrees that they ought to be educated. If the children are of a tribe fitted for manufacturers of woollens, and the members of the tribe are engaged largely as herdsmen and own sheep, of course the President of the United States, or the Secretary of the Interior, who knows something about Indians, (and I believe he does not belong to one of these eastern communities that is not to be permitted to express its opinion here,) will be very apt to know it, and will make proper regulations. The instruction on which is now going on with so much success at Hampton, at Carlisle, and at Forest Grove is that instruction which fits these children to go back to their tribe and be useful and industrious, not merely to make speeches to the Indians in English!

I do not agree with the honorable Senator from Kansas, that the experience of the Navajoes, as he has related it, warrants us in pursuing a policy which is to confirm them in their nomadic habits. Pretty soon settlements will approach the land. Then we shall have propositions in Congress to build railroads through their territory; we shall have propositions in Congress to purchase their lands; mines may be discovered possibly under the soil which the Indians own; and then how long will the Senator's children and my children, or his neighbors and my neighbors (if we can judge anything from the experience of the past) permit a small tribe like that to wander over hundreds of square leagues of territory fit for the occupation of white men?

The Senator does not in his entire speech make a point which as it seems to me is inconsistent with the proposition I have made. All I have to say is this, and it may be summed up in one statement; you are paying now to feed in idleness, in ignorance, in savagery, \$60 a year on an average for every youth of these Indian tribes. I do not mean "you" specially, but the past policy of the Government continued will continue that thing for a thousand years, and you will have in addition all the expenses of wars, the terror, the injury to the value of lands on the border which we have had in the past. Now take for five years that expenditure of \$60 a year and add \$140 a year more, which is enough, for every one of these youths, and you have them during the process as hostages for the good behavior of their tribes, and you send them back in a single generation ready to make their tribe self-supporting. That is the whole proposition.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President—

Mr. PLUMB. Allow me a word.

Mr. BECK. I will yield a moment to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PLUMB. My quarrel, if it may be so called, with the Senator from Massachusetts is that the Senator in his *résumé* of the Indian question commenced with the dealings of the people west of the Alleghanies. I do not differ with him so much substantially—

Mr. HOAR. Now, if my honorable friend from Kansas will allow me, I deny having referred to any dealings with the Indians except the dealings of this Government at Washington.

Mr. PLUMB. This is just exactly what I stated. He commenced at a convenient point away from the responsibility of the community of which he is now the representative. I say that in order to put this Indian question properly before the country not only for the purpose of actual knowledge but for the purpose of enlightenment and for the purpose of instruction for the future, we ought to take it all, not only for the convenience of persons speaking on this floor but in making history, and not commence at a point where the responsibilities of certain communities ended. That is the objection I have. As I said, that is a part of the plan which seems to be carried out in the book I have spoken of, *A Century of Dishonor*, and which conveniently did not go back any further and take in the dealings of the people of the New England coast with the tribes they found there.

Mr. BECK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. GARLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BECK. I do not desire an executive session for more than five minutes. I want to make some reports.

Mr. GARLAND. An executive session of five minutes will amount to nothing.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it is too late to have an executive session to-day.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Kentucky allow me to make a statement to the Senate? I desire to say that to-morrow morning, when this bill comes up, I propose to limit the amount in my amendment, which is now \$2,000,000, to \$500,000, and put it in the discretion of the President, and to take the vote on the amendment in that shape.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at five o'clock and forty-five minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 30, 1882.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. D. POWER.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KASSON. I move to dispense with the morning hour, and that being done I shall give way to some gentlemen for matters which will not give rise to debate.

Mr. CALKINS. Before that motion is put I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the notice I gave some days ago, I will call up this morning for consideration by the House the Utah contested-election case of Campbell against Cannon.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Iowa is in order.

Mr. KASSON. After that the gentleman from Indiana can raise his point.

The motion was agreed to; and the morning hour was dispensed with, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof.

### LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. MILLS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to print in the RECORD as part of the debates some remarks on interstate commerce. [See Appendix.]

### LICENSE FEES OF OFFICERS OF STEAM-VESSELS.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill No. 383, to amend section 4458 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to license fees of officers of steam-vessels, and put it upon its passage. I will say to the House that a bill of this character passed the House some weeks ago, and is now in the Senate. This bill, to the same purpose and extent, passed the Senate and is now on the Speaker's table. The only difference between the two is, that while we fixed the fees of these officers at seventy-five cents and one dollar and a half, the Senate, responding to the suggestion of the Department, fixes them at fifty cents.

I will say further, in this connection, that the accumulated fund arising from these fees now in the Treasury amounts to nearly \$700,000, sufficient to pay the expenses of this system for a quarter of a century if nothing else is added. This bill which passed the Senate has the recommendation of the Department, and I hope there will be no objection to its passage by the House.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill was read a first and second time. It is as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.,* That section 4458 of the Revised Statutes be, and is hereby, amended by striking out of the paragraph, beginning in the eighth line thereof, the following words, that is to say: "Each master, chief engineer, and first-class pilot licensed as herein provided shall pay for every certificate granted by any inspector or inspectors the sum of \$10; and every chief mate, engineer, and pilot of an inferior grade shall pay for every certificate so granted the sum of \$5;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Each master, engineer, pilot, and matelicensed as herein provided shall pay for every certificate granted by any inspector or inspectors the sum of fifty cents."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] has called up the Senate bill, and I wish to add a few words to what he has so clearly stated. The people whom I have the honor to represent have by petition and otherwise for many successive Congresses called attention to the propriety, justice, and necessity of this legislation. Early in the first session of the Forty-fifth Congress I presented a petition upon this subject signed by several hundred pilots and engineers of the western waters. Other gentlemen at the same time presented similar petitions. After resting so many years under this unjust discrimination I hope that their cry for relief will at last be heard and heeded. Why should it not be? What reason can be given for demanding of this one class a tax of \$10 for pursuing a legitimate, responsible, and honorable vocation? Why should not every trade and profession be required to pay a similar license and rest under a similar burden? Will it be said that the pilots, mates, and engineers of a steamboat are intrusted with human life, and that this justifies the Government in scrutinizing their

qualifications? Grant that to be true, and yet it would only authorize a charge sufficient to cover the actual expense of issuing the license, which would not be more than fifty cents. But, if this be a ground for demanding a fee of the engineers and officers of a steamboat, is it not equally applicable to other occupations? Take our railroads as an example. Are not our papers daily burdened with the details of dreadful disasters—collisions, misplaced switches, neglected signals—the outgrowth of official carelessness or criminal incompetency? What good reason can be given for demanding a license of the engineer of a steamboat that does not apply with equal, aye, with tenfold force, to the locomotive engineers of your numerous passenger trains?

But not only, Mr. Speaker, is the license now demanded an odious discrimination against a most worthy class of citizens, not only does it single them out as objects of some peculiar suspicion, to be placed under the eye of official espionage and surveillance, thus placing upon them a mark of dishonor and reproach, but it is the infliction of a pecuniary hardship. The great majority of our river men are in humble circumstances. The nomadic life which they lead, the large expenses consequent upon their necessary absence from their families, and the prodigal manner in which they use their scanty means, makes this annual tax of \$10 a heavy burden upon them and their families. The tax, as we know, was first imposed during the war, and was one of the many means of resources then called into existence. Since it was placed upon the statute-book over \$600,000 have been collected and are now in the Treasury as a distinct, separate fund. Not only is this large amount thus derived now standing to the credit of this fund, but as we all know the revenues of the Treasury from other sources during the past year have been enormously great, far beyond the necessary demands of the Government. With over \$100,000,000 of annual surplus revenue coming into our Treasury can we not afford to repeal this odious personal tax, a relic of the war, a tax, as I have said, discriminating in its nature, extortionate in its effect, and exceptional in its character?

Sir, if necessary, I would appeal to the generosity as well as the justice of this House. Representing as I do a city which has a communication by navigable rivers of over 12,000 miles, I know well the history and character of the men in whose behalf I now appeal to this House for relief. Bold, self-reliant, and energetic, they have been the hardy pioneers of civilization and commerce in our Western country, extending the boundaries of its power and adding to its growth and prosperity. Gallant, brave, and patriotic, they have been ever ready to man your vessels and gunboats, achieving in war victories no less renowned than those of peace. Generous and self-forgetful, the sailors and mariners of every country have been the chosen objects of legislative bounty and protection. Shall we not imitate this worthy example by extending to them now and here the hand of relief and friendship?

And in conclusion, sir, may I not suggest that the present is a most favorable opportunity to grant the relief asked for in this bill? The cry for cheap transportation is coming to this Congress from all parts of this land. The oppressive exactions of railroads is exciting the deepest interest among all classes of our people. The battle against monopolies is already and fiercely begun. Where do our constituents look for safety? Where can they look for aid and succor and protection in the contest with these great and growing evils? Where and how is this demand for cheap food and transportation to be answered? Where, except on and through the mighty rivers and lakes whose navigation and destiny are committed to the strong arms and brave hearts of the men who are now appealing to us to honor and to aid their vocation?

Sir, I hope that appeal will be listened to, and the pittance asked for now will be granted by this House without a dissenting voice.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read a third time, was passed.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### CLARA A. THOMPSON.

Mr. RANDALL, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5567) granting a pension to Mrs. Clara A. Thompson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

#### PENSION LAWS.

Mr. JOYCE, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. No. 1410) to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or a leg in the service; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. HOGUE introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5563) to enable the Solicitor of the Treasury to carry out the provisions of sections 3749 and 3750 of the Revised Statutes, and of the act of June 14, 1878, relating to lands of the United States in his charge, and to amend the same; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

#### CONFEDERATED OTOWE AND MISSOURIA INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. VALENTINE. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill No. 930, to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the remainder of the reservation of the confederated Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1881. These Indians have nearly all gone into the Indian Territory, and are desirous of disposing of their lands in order that they may get the benefit of the purchase-money.

The SPEAKER. The title will be read, after which objections will be asked for.

The title of the bill was reported.

Mr. RANDALL. I will make an objection until I can ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question, whether this bill has been considered in any committee of the House?

Mr. VALENTINE. It has not.

Mr. RANDALL. Then I object.

Mr. VALENTINE. Wait a moment. I say that it has not been considered by a committee, but I took the bill to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and asked him to examine it closely, and see if there were any objections to it. He stated there were none, in his judgment.

• Mr. RANDALL. I object. On the subject of Indian lands the committee should act in formal meetings.

Mr. VALENTINE. Then I ask that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the bill was taken from the Speaker's table, read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### CENSUS REPORTS.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to make a privileged report from the Committee on Printing. The committee to whom was referred a resolution providing for the printing of volume 1 of the Census Reports, direct me to report the same back to the House and recommend the passage of a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The substitute will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for joint resolution H. R. No. 160, joint resolution H. R. No. 182 to print 50,000 copies of the statistics of the population of the United States, &c.

Resolved, &c., That there be printed and bound 55,000 copies of the volume lately issued by the Census Office, characterized Statistics of the Population of the United States, by States, Counties, and Minor Civil Divisions, compiled from the returns of the tenth census, 15,000 copies to be for the use of the Senate, 35,000 copies to be for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for distribution by the Secretary of the Interior, as now provided by law.

The joint resolution was read a first and second time.

Mr. SPRINGER. If I can have the attention of the House I will explain this in one moment.

This resolution provides for the printing of 55,000 copies of the first volume of the census on the subject of population. Under the law as it now stands the Interior Department, through the Census Office, has printed but 1,000 copies of this volume; it has not been printed for circulation at all but merely for the use of the Interior Department. It is now in stereotype plates ready for printing and such distribution among the people as Congress may provide by a resolution; and this is the first resolution which has been introduced for the purpose of providing for an enlarged circulation.

Mr. KASSON. I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] how soon we may expect the copies to be ready for distribution?

Mr. SPRINGER. The work is now all ready for printing, the stereotyping and everything necessary having been done; and as soon as the order is made the printing will begin.

Mr. KASSON. I desire to ask the gentleman farther how many copies does he propose to allow for distribution by each member of the House?

Mr. SPRINGER. The resolution provides that there shall be 35,000 copies for the use of the House, 15,000 for the use of the Senate, and 5,000 for the use of the Interior Department.

Mr. KASSON. How many will that be for each member?

Mr. SPRINGER. The number of copies for each member will be something over one hundred.

Mr. DUNNELL. I desire to ask the gentlemen from Illinois whether this volume which he now proposes to have printed takes the place of what has been heretofore denominated the Compendium of the Census?

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not. The compendium will be published hereafter when all the volumes are out. This is the first volume of the full report of the census on the subject of population, and is all the Department has to publish on that subject. The cost of this volume will be, according to the estimate I have obtained from the Public Printer, for printing the first 1,000 volumes, \$3,574.12; for printing 10,000 copies, \$20,741.20, and the same for each additional 10,000 copies, or about \$2 a volume for this volume. There is a great demand for this book at present, and as this is the first volume of the census members desire early action upon the resolution.

Mr. KASSON. Will the gentleman from Illinois state about what time the compendium which is usually the volume for general circulation may be expected to be ready?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am not able to answer that question.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I have the information from the Superintendent of the Census that it will not be ready for several months.



Mr. SPRINGER. I suppose it will be ready in six or eight months.  
Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio. This is the volume which is most sought after and desired by the public.

Mr. SPRINGER. So I understand.

Mr. HUBBELL. I desire to offer an amendment if it is in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will hear the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HUBBELL. Will the gentleman from Illinois accept an amendment to increase the number of copies?

Mr. SPRINGER. The Committee on Printing have made this recommendation in view of the number of copies of former publications of the same kind; and at the request of the Secretary of the Interior they have included 5,000 copies for the use of that Department. It is, however, for the House to determine the number of copies which shall be printed of this and of the other volumes. But I may state that additional copies may hereafter be ordered without any inconvenience, as the plates are stereotyped.

Mr. HUBBELL. I suppose I give the experience of every member of this House when I say that I have applications on file now for nearly double the number of copies which this resolution proposes to give to each member. It is a volume very much sought after. It embraces the sort of information we ought to give the people if we give them any at all. Therefore I offer an amendment to double the number suggested by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BAYNE, (to Mr. SPRINGER.) Accept that amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUBBELL] can accomplish his purpose by increasing the number to be allowed to the House of Representatives. There is a great disproportion between the numbers allowed by the resolution to the House and to the Senate in proportion to the number of Senators. But it was supposed the Senators, representing States, would have a larger demand upon them. I think if the gentleman would move to increase the number only to members of the House, the object he has in view would be accomplished.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUBBELL] to be to increase the number from 35,000 for the use of the House to 70,000 for the use of the House, and to increase the gross number ordered to be printed 35,000.

Mr. KASSON. I think it is important that we should be careful to understand this. The compendium is the popular volume. That contains all the facts of interest to the people. These larger volumes contain details which are not required for the information of the people at large. They contain special information; and I think it bad policy to increase so enormously the number of copies of the larger volumes with the larger cost instead of ordering a larger number of compendiums when they shall be printed.

I regret very much the delay which has been suggested here as likely to attend the presentation of that compendium. But I think we had better wait to order the larger number of copies until the compendium has been presented.

Mr. KELLEY. The compendium cannot be printed for some years, for the very good reason that the facts which will be summarized in that compendium have not been collected. This is true of several of the departments of the census, some of which are very important.

I hope that the number of copies of this volume proposed to be printed will be largely increased. This volume will be in more request than any volume ever published by Congress. From the publication of the volume which I hold in my hand the source of statistics will take a new character, and the new era will date from the American census of 1880. The maps in this volume are unlike anything the world has ever seen. A gentleman in a single evening, by going over these maps, can get the pith of all the information embodied in this volume. I trust, therefore, that the largest number proposed will be adopted by the House, in justice to our country, and to give this work its proper position among the statisticians of the world.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio. I desire to say that 35,000 copies for the House will give to each member 120 copies; and doubling that number will of course give each member 240 copies, which I think is little enough. I think, therefore, that the House ought to adopt the amendment.

Mr. REED. I think that before the House decides upon this question members had better bear in mind the fact that this volume is only the initial volume, and that there is likely to be a large number of volumes in addition to this. If we start out with an edition of seventy or eighty thousand copies of this volume, it must be continued with all the other volumes.

Mr. HUBBELL. It ought to be continued. There never was a census taken before in which the people had so much interest. If there is any information which we should furnish the people of this country, it is the information contained in these volumes.

Mr. REED. All the information will be contained in a more accessible form in the compendium.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the House will vote down all amendments now, and pass the resolution as reported by the Committee on Printing. That committee, as soon as they have ascertained the number of volumes that are to be published, will bring in a general law to cover the whole series, providing for such number as certainly will satisfy the desire of members. This is intended to be a temporary relief to members who are receiving urgent appeals from their constituents for this volume. It will not delay the publication in the future of such number of the other volumes as Congress may desire

to order. I hope, therefore, that the House will allow this resolution to pass in its present shape.

Mr. ATKINS. I think this is a little premature, and that the resolution had better be recommitted to the Committee on Printing so that action may be uniform upon this subject. I do not want any little spasmodic affairs of this kind.

Mr. HUBBELL. This is no spasmodic affair.

Mr. SPRINGER. We do not yet know how many volumes there are to be.

Mr. CASWELL. I want to say that I think the number proposed by the committee is large enough. It will give each member of the House 115 copies. There are yet to follow some forty or fifty volumes of this character, and the total amount will be simply enormous if we increase the number for the House to 70,000 copies. I think the report of the committee should be adopted as it now is.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. HUBBELL,] to increase the number of copies for the House to 70,000.

The question was taken; and upon a division there were—ayes 98, noes 42.

So (no further count being called for) the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUBBELL moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. KASSON. Let the resolution as amended be now read.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That there be printed and bound 90,000 copies of the volume lately issued by the Census Office characterized Statistics of the Population of the United States by States, Counties, and Minor Civil Divisions, compiled from the returns of the tenth census; 15,000 copies to be for the use of the Senate, 70,000 copies to be for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for distribution by the Secretary of the Interior as now provided by law.

The joint resolution as amended was then ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

The question was upon the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON, of New York. I do not know but it would be well to have the yeas and nays, for I think we are rather too hasty in this matter, making so large an order.

Mr. HAZELTON. The Senate can make any correction that is necessary.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York call for the yeas and nays?

Mr. ROBINSON, of New York. I do not antagonize this resolution to any extent, but I think we are rushing a little too fast. However, I will withdraw the call for the yeas and nays.

The joint resolution was then passed.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The title of the joint resolution should be amended to correspond with the amendment made in the body of the joint resolution, by changing the total number from 55,000 to 90,000. If there is no objection, that change will be made.

There was no objection, and the title was amended accordingly.

#### REPORTS OF THE FISH COMMISSION.

Mr. SPRINGER also reported back from the Committee on Printing, with a favorable recommendation, the following concurrent resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring.)* That of the reports prepared under the direction of the United States Fish Commission for the census of 1880, 1,500 additional copies be printed from the stereotype plates for the use of and distribution by the Fish Commission.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATIONS FOR INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. By direction of the Committee on Public Grounds, and because the measure demands early action, I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Speaker's table Senate bill No. 1361, to provide additional accommodations for the Department of the Interior. If the bill be taken up, I propose, by direction of the committee, to submit an amendment reducing the appropriation from \$20,000 to \$15,000.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the sum of \$20,000 be, and hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Interior to rent or lease from year to year a suitable building or buildings for additional accommodations for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to ask whether this bill has been considered by any committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. This matter has been very carefully considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House; and we have already reported a bill of similar character, which is now before the Committee on Appropriations, proposing an expenditure of \$15,000 for this specific purpose. We have also considered the matter since this Senate bill has been upon the Speaker's table;

and we are still of opinion that \$15,000 will secure the requisite accommodations. We ask that an amendment reducing the appropriation to this amount be incorporated in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I move to amend by striking out "twenty" and inserting "fifteen," so as to make the appropriation \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### BRIDGE OVER MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the House take from the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union House bill No. 3571 for present consideration. This is a bill authorizing the Saint Louis, Carondelet and Forest Park Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Missouri River. The bill contains all the requirements and conditions which have been inserted in bills of the same character; and it is exactly similar, I believe, to a bill passed a few days ago by the House.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. No. 3571) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near Hamburg, Missouri.

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve the right to object after the bill has been read.

Mr. WASHBURN. In order to save time I will state that this bill is of precisely the same character as other bills that have been reported by the Committee on Commerce. The rights of navigation are protected in every respect; and every provision which has been inserted in any bill of this character is in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] desire that the bill be read?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That it shall be lawful for the Saint Louis, Carondelet and Forest Park Railroad Company, a corporation created by the laws of the State of Missouri, or its assigns or successors, or any other legally incorporated railroad company which may be associated with it therein, to build a bridge and maintain the same across the Missouri River at or within nine miles of the town of Hamburg, in the county of Saint Charles, State of Missouri.

SEC. 2. That the bridge to be constructed under this act shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized as a post-route; and for the transmission of the mails, troops, and munitions of war of the United States or for passengers or freight passing over said bridge no higher charge shall be made than the rate per mile paid for their transportation over the railroads and public highways leading to said bridge; and it shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States.

SEC. 3. That if said bridge be made with unbroken and continuous spans, the spans thereof shall not be less than three hundred feet in length in the clear, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the river. The lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge shall be at least fifty feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, and the bridge shall be at right angles to and its piers parallel with the current of the river: *Provided*, That if the same shall be constructed as a draw-bridge, the draw or pivot shall be over the main channel of the river at an accessible navigable point; and the spans of the draw shall not be less than one hundred and sixty feet in length in the clear on each side of the central or pivot pier of the draw; and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with, and the bridge itself at right angles to, the current of the river; and the spans shall not be less than ten feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, to the lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge: *Provided also*, That said draw shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passing of boats; and said company or corporation shall maintain, at its own expense, from sunset till sunrise, such lights or other signals as the Light-House Board shall prescribe. No bridge shall be erected or maintained under the authority of this act which shall at any time substantially or materially obstruct the free navigation of said river; and if any bridge erected under such authority shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, obstruct such navigation, he is hereby authorized to cause such change or alteration of said bridge to be made as will effectually obviate such obstruction; and all such alterations shall be made and all such obstructions be removed at the expense of the owner or owners of said bridge. And in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, the case may be brought in the district court of the United States of the State of Missouri in which any portion of said obstruction or bridge may be located: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed so as to repeal or modify any of the provisions of law now existing in reference to the protection of the navigation of rivers, or to exempt this bridge from the operation of the same.

SEC. 4. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridge shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same and over the approaches thereto, upon payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge and the several railroad companies, or any one of them desiring such use, shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid and upon rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon a hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties.

SEC. 5. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe, and to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge and a map of the location, giving for the space of one mile above and one mile below the proposed location the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the currents at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be

built; and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 6. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBESON. In order to avoid unnecessary consumption of time, I object.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. ROBESON. Well, I object on a broader principle. I object, and shall object hereafter, to important legislation going through here by unanimous consent. If gentlemen desire important measures considered, there are rules under which it can be done.

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. CLARK. It is unfortunate the gentleman from New Jersey did not think of that sooner.

The SPEAKER. The right to object was reserved by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN,] and of course the right can be exercised by any other gentleman.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that Tuesday, the 25th of April, be set for the consideration of the bill for the admission of Dakota.

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan. Would Wednesday suit the gentleman?

Mr. RANDALL. No day that week would suit.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Several members called for the regular order.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. In accordance with the warning of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROBESON] there can be no more proceedings by unanimous consent.

#### ADDITIONAL EMPLOYÉS IN THE FOLDING-ROOM.

Mr. URNER. I desire to call up the unfinished business which went over yesterday, the report of the Committee on Accounts in regard to the employment of additional men in the folding-room.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland calls up the unfinished business of yesterday, a resolution reported from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to employ twelve additional laborers in the House folding-room for the purpose of folding speeches, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$720 per annum while employed: *Provided*, That the said twelve additional employes shall be dropped from the rolls of the Doorkeeper at a period not more than one month after the expiration of the present session.

Mr. URNER. It has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, by the gentleman who introduced this resolution and who had it referred that we had better correct it by inserting after the word "speeches" the words "and documents."

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection that modification will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. URNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish now to make an explanation in regard to the necessities, as we understand them, of this service. When this resolution was first referred to the Committee on Accounts, and when the Committee on Accounts desired to consider it, they sent for the Doorkeeper, the superintendent of the folding-room, the chief clerk of the folding-room, and the foreman of the laborers or the actual folders in the folding-room. The last-named gentleman has been in that employment four or five years—several Congresses, at any rate—and we were informed these additional employes were absolutely necessary in order to do the work which was to be done.

And we were also under the impression, from the information we then got, that it was not an increase. I have since yesterday examined the records of past Congresses, as far back as the Thirty-sixth Congress. I find up to the Forty-fifth Congress there had been simply an appropriation in bulk for materials and labor in the folding-room. In the Forty-fifth Congress there was a special appropriation made for the different persons to be employed, and there were twenty persons named in that appropriation bill for the Forty-fifth Congress. There was but one appropriation bill, as the House will remember, in the Forty-fifth Congress, the second appropriation bill failing to pass for reasons we all remember.

In the extra session of the Forty-sixth Congress the appropriation bill of the Forty-fifth Congress was continued with some few modifications, among which was an increase of five folders in the folding-room, making at that time twenty-five men to be employed in the folding-room. And then it was, in 1880, during the extra session of the Forty-sixth Congress, a resolution was passed by the House increasing the number ten, which made it thirty-five persons.

There are now, as I am informed by the Doorkeeper and the superintendent of the folding-room, thirty persons employed in folding documents and speeches, and they are distributed and are employed in receiving and sending out the mail direct from the folding-department. A great many members of Congress, we are informed, have their documents mailed direct from the folding-room and do not therefore have them sent to their rooms. Four are employed in filling the orders of members. One man is employed in keeping a register of accounts of members in regard to their documents. Then



there is one person employed on a speech-book, keeping an account of speeches; one for miscellaneous work, a man-of-all-work around the department, who is considered one of the most important men.

Then there is one man employed in piling up books and keeping them in order so that they shall not collect in a miscellaneous and confused mass. There is one person employed in carrying the books from the tables to the folders, and his services, we are informed, are very important. Then there are nineteen employed in the actual folding of books, that is, putting them in wrappers for mailing.

So far as computation can be made there are about two hundred thousand speeches already in the folding-room waiting to be folded. There are from twenty to thirty thousand speeches coming into the folding-room daily. Members are clamoring for the speeches for which they have subscribed, desiring to send them to their constituents, but they are unable to get them with that promptness the Door-keeper and his assistant desire to furnish them, because of the lack of force. Then there are 4,000 documents coming in daily in the shape of books from the Government Printing Office. And to-day a resolution has been passed providing for another publication.

Now, then, the less number of persons employed in the Forty-fifth Congress and in the Forty-sixth Congress is not able to do the work, because the Government Printing Office was then behind in its work. The members of the House will all remember that the Government Printing Office a year or two ago very frequently stopped its work, and to a great extent furloughed its hands, but now the superintendent of the folding-room is receiving from the Government Printing Office agricultural reports of 1879, three years behind hand. The Government Printing Office, in other words, is working its full force and sending these documents to the Capitol at the rate of 4,000 copies a day, and speeches at the rate of twenty to thirty thousand a day. There is an immense number already on hand, and the Committee on Accounts, believing this increase of force was necessary for the service, and without stopping to inquire particularly whether the Thirty-sixth or the Thirty-seventh, or the Forty-fifth or the Forty-sixth Congress employed more men or less men, they thought this Congress needed these men to do the work that there is to be done, and recommended the adoption of the pending resolution. I hope it will be adopted without further delay.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. URNER moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### DRY-DOCK, DES MOINES CANAL.

Mr. PAGE. I desire to make a privileged report from the Committee on Commerce. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report back the following resolution, and recommend its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be requested to furnish the House with any information in his possession concerning the need of a Government dry-dock at the Des Moines Rapids Canal, on the Mississippi River, together with the views of the Department on the subject.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled Senate bills of the following titles:

A bill (S. No. 864) to confirm certain instructions given by the Department of the Interior to the Indian agent at Green Bay agency, in the State of Wisconsin, and to legalize the acts done and permitted by said Indian agent pursuant thereto; and

A bill (S. No. 90) to pay the creditors of the late Henry O. Waggoner, late consular clerk at Lyons, France; when the Speaker signed the same.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. OATES, for ten days, on account of important business; and  
To Mr. SCOVILLE, for three days.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. BLACKBURN to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Mary Callan.

On motion of Mr. CALKINS, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to withdraw papers filed in the several election cases from South Carolina, as shown in the tabulated list below, to be returned to the district attorney of South Carolina, printed copies of the same having been left on file with the Committee on Elections:

Mr. CALKINS asks leave to withdraw the papers shown in tabulated list herewith filed, and return them to the district attorney of South Carolina, printed copies having been left on file with the Committee on Elections:

#### United States supervisors' reports.

##### SMALLS VS. TILLMAN.

Varisville precinct, Hampton County, South Carolina.  
Williston precinct, Barnwell County, South Carolina.  
Williston precinct, Barnwell County, South Carolina.

##### MACKEY VS. O'CONNOR.

City Hall precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Court-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Market Hall precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Palmetto Engine-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Hope Engine-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Eagle Engine-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Marion Engine-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Ashley Engine-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Ward No. 8, Niagara Engine-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Henderson Store precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Twenty-two-Mile House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Blackville precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Saint Stephen's precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Muster-House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Benjamin Potter's precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Dell's Bluff (Saint Andrew's) precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Pineopolis precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Cooper Store precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Mount Pleasant precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
John's Island House precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Haut Gap precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Black Oak precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Strawberry Ferry precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Calamus Pond precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Biggin Church precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Ten-Mile Hill precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Brick Church (Saint Andrew's) precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Enterprise precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Camp Ground (Edisto Island) precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Cross-Road precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Cross-Road precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Stonewall Engine-house precinct, Charleston County, South Carolina.  
Branchville precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Zeigler's precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Jamison precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Orange precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Brown's precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Connor's precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Washington Seminary precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Rowesville precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Corbettsville precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Bull Swamp precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Bull Swamp precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Gleaton's precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Cedar Grove precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Bookhardt's precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Fogle's precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Lewisville precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Fort Motte precinct, Orangeburg County, South Carolina.  
Fulton precinct, Clarendon County, South Carolina.  
Calhoun precinct, Clarendon County, South Carolina.  
Witherspoon precinct, Clarendon County, South Carolina.  
Jordan's precinct, Clarendon County, South Carolina.  
Fork precinct, Clarendon County, South Carolina.  
Packville precinct, Clarendon County, South Carolina.

##### LEE VS. RICHARDSON.

Marion precinct, Marion County, South Carolina.  
Berry's Road precinct, Marion County, South Carolina.  
Ariel's precinct, Marion County, South Carolina.  
Campbell's Bridge precinct, Marion County, South Carolina.  
Clio precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Brownsville precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Red Bluff precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Brightsville precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Bernettsville precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Smithsville precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Hebron precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Hebron precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Adamsville precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Red Hill precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Cartersville precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Society Hill precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Timmonsville precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Effingham precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Leavenworth precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Lydia precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Lisbon precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Hartsville precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Graham Cross-Roads precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Salters' precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Cedar Swamp precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Sutton's precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Greeleysville precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Midway precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Kingstree precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Gourdin precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Black Mingo precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Pipkins precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Indiantown precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Anderson precinct, Williamsburgh County, South Carolina.  
Court-House precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Pedee precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Santee precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Sansit precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Upper Waccaman precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Carver's Bay precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Choppee precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Lower Waccaman precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.  
Lynchburgh precinct, Sumter County, South Carolina.  
Sumter, No. 1 precinct, Sumter County, South Carolina.  
Carter's Crossing precinct, Sumter County, South Carolina.  
Rafton Creek precinct, Sumter County, South Carolina.  
Martin Hill precinct, Henry County, South Carolina.  
Cheraw precinct, Chesterfield County, South Carolina.

##### POLL LISTS.

Timminsville precinct, Darlington County, South Carolina.  
Sumter, No. 2 precinct, Sumter County, South Carolina.  
Bennettsville precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Adamsville precinct, Marlborough County, South Carolina.  
Highhill precinct, Marion County, South Carolina.  
Mount Nebo precinct, Marion County, South Carolina.  
Brown's Ferry precinct, Georgetown County, South Carolina.

## BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. WASHBURN as a conferee on the part of the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the amendments of the House to the bill of the Senate (No. 308) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the most accessible point within five miles above Saint Charles, Missouri, in place of Mr. PAGE, excused on his own request.

## ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, of Iowa, by unanimous consent, from the Select Committee on Law Respecting Election of President and Vice President, reported a bill (H. R. No. 5569) to carry into effect the provisions of the Constitution respecting the election of President and Vice-President of the United States; which was read a first and second time, ordered to be printed, and recommitted to the said committee.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KASSON. I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CALKINS. I desire to call up the contested-election case of Campbell vs. Cannon from the Territory of Utah. I wish to state to the House in this connection that if the House shall decide at this time not to consider this contested-election case, I shall take it that they do not want to consider it until the close of the debate on the tariff-commission bill. I believe, however, that we ought to consider and dispose of it now.

Mr. SPRINGER. Any time this summer will do for that.

Mr. KASSON. I believe our situation in reference to the Utah case is very good, and therefore I must raise the question of consideration at this time.

Mr. CALKINS. Before that motion is submitted I desire again to state that the Committee on Elections, I believe unanimously, have agreed that this case ought now to be disposed of, and that is the reason I urge it. I therefore ask the House to proceed with the consideration of that case.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now proceed to the consideration of the contested-election case?

The House divided; and there were—ayes 40, noes 60.

Mr. CALKINS. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but that is not a very decided vote, and I ask that tellers be appointed. Tellers were not ordered, twenty-three members only voting therefor.

So the House refused to proceed with the consideration of the contested-election case.

Mr. CALKINS. I give notice now that at the close of the discussion on this tariff-commission bill I will insist upon the consideration of this case.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, informed the House that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A joint resolution (S. R. No. 9) to authorize the Secretary of War to lease the temporary use of the United States barracks at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, to the State Institution for the Blind;

A bill (S. No. 27) to repeal section 8 of an act entitled "An act to accept and ratify the agreement submitted by the confederated bands of Ute Indians in Colorado, for the sale of their reservation in said State, and for other purposes, and to make the necessary appropriations for carrying out the same," approved June 15, 1880;

A bill (S. No. 241) for the relief of John T. Hennaman, of Baltimore, Maryland;

A bill (S. No. 251) granting a pension to Alice McMahon;

A bill (S. No. 455) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. West;

A bill (S. No. 521) donating a part of the abandoned military reservation at Fort Smith, Arkansas, to the city of Fort Smith for the use and benefit of the free public schools thereof, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. No. 551) releasing Frank Soule, late collector of internal revenue for the first district of California, and his sureties, from liability to the Government of the United States;

A bill (S. No. 585) for the relief of Thomas B. Shannon;

A bill (S. No. 855) granting a right of way through public lands to the Palatka and Indian River Railway Company;

A bill (S. No. 932) to provide for the settlement of the estates of deceased Kickapoo Indians in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. No. 945) to provide for the payment of ten claims for depredations committed by the Ute Indians at the White River agency in 1879; and

A bill (S. No. 1389) to establish the eastern judicial district of Kentucky.

## TARIFF COMMISSION.

Mr. KASSON. I now renew the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 2315) to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate the question of the tariff and internal-revenue laws.

The gentleman from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. DUNNELL. Mr. Chairman, I am fully satisfied that when we assembled here in December last the people of the country expected of this Congress a revision of the existing tariff laws. They had become aware of their character and their practical operation through the reports of the officers of the Government, public speeches, and the press. Changes in these laws had been asked of Congress by the fiscal officers of the Government for a series of years. The people were not ignorant of the changes which had been wrought during the operation or existence of these laws. They had found out that certain provisions of the tariff were so complicated and cumbersome that they had given rise in their execution to innumerable questions for contest; that blunders, to say the least, not a few, were made in the revenue laws when the statutes were revised; and that over two thousand suits were pending in the Federal courts to settle disputes between the importers and the Government. They had heard of the alleged frauds which were practiced in the importation of sugar and various other articles of foreign merchandise. They remembered also the promises and pledges which were made in 1874 by Democratic orators and newspapers, that the tariff should be revised and largely changed if only the Republican party should be driven from power in this House. They had witnessed the weakness of the Democratic party when it came into power, and the non-fulfillment of its promises, and heard with pleasure the assurances of Republican speakers that the Republicans, if returned to power, would do what their opponents had failed to do.

The expectation was everywhere entertained that this Congress would revise the tariff laws. This will not be denied; and it ought not to be denied that they need revision. The presence of this tariff-commission bill, if honestly here, is an admission of this. The honorable gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] who opened the debate on the pending bill pointed out different methods by which these changes may be reached, and defended the commission bill as the one most worthy of use.

Let me here remark that I do not take my present position in opposition to the commission bill because I desire to be singular in my attitude, or because I assume for myself judgment superior to those with whom I have been associated on the Committee on Ways and Means, but I do it on the grounds that the revenue laws now in force need revision, and that this Congress has no right to adopt any method that puts it beyond itself. In the Committee on Ways and Means I deemed it a duty to vote against the tariff-commission bill now under discussion. The reasons which influenced my vote in the committee were there briefly given; but it is my purpose now to elaborate these reasons and also attempt other arguments in support of the attitude which it seemed a duty for me to assume in regard to the tariff question.

It is my opinion and will be my argument that the tariff needs change, modification, revision; that it is the duty of this Congress immediately to enter upon the work and not indefinitely postpone it by the appointment of a commission. It is my conviction that this commission if created by Congress and set in operation will utterly fail to meet the expectations of every member who hopes or desires to get a revision of the tariff by this Congress. If we shall secure a revision through that commission, I venture the assertion that the men who are the most earnest in its support will be the most disappointed.

To establish the correctness of these views it will be incumbent upon me, I confess, to demonstrate that the interests of the Government and of the people demand a new or amended schedule of tariff rates; that this demand is so pressing that Congress cannot, without furnishing just cause for public censure and disapproval, neglect forthwith to enter upon the work, and that the appointment of a commission is delay, and will work such a delay that this Congress will expire before the needed changes are made, and will do no more than turn over to the Forty-eighth Congress a mass of material with which, perchance, it may have no sympathy and by which it may refuse to be guided.

Before entering upon any attempt to make clear the correctness of my position, allow me to say that I do not deem it necessary to discuss the relative merits of a protective and a revenue tariff. It is not essential to a fair consideration of this question that we should even denominate the existing tariff as a protective tariff. While it is such and was intended to be such, while under it the Government has raised immensely large revenues, revenues which a war and a large public debt made necessary and without which the public faith could not have been kept or scarcely the Government itself been saved, yet I contend that the questions which confront this Congress are whether the tariff needs revision and when and how it shall be made.

I respectfully maintain, with the fiscal officers of the Government, that the custom laws need radical changes, and personally insist that the real question before us is wholly outside of the question as to how the revision shall leave it. Near the close of my remarks I shall quote from a speech of the late President Garfield, and use it as a text to express my own views on some phases of the tariff question, and to combat some statements made by the honorable gentleman



from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] who addressed the committee yesterday.

Vast changes have taken place since 1865 in the trade and manufacturing interests of the country. Raw materials and manufactured articles have wonderfully changed their intrinsic as well as their relative values in a great many instances during this long period. Discoveries in manufactures and improvements in machinery, as well as the new uses to which manufactures have been put, within this time, have put out of joint the present tariff laws.

What, when the law was made, demanded and received specific duties should in many cases now have an ad valorem duty; and what had an ad valorem duty affixed to it should have now a specific duty. Many articles which justly bore a low ad valorem rate of duty when the law was passed are now well nigh prohibited. It would be easy to continue an enumeration of the incongruities now found in the laws whose amendment is the subject of this debate. For two or three years before his retirement Secretary Sherman annually called the attention of Congress to a revision of the tariff. During the last Congress he appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and personally urged immediate action. He fully and ably set forth the difficulties attending the administration of many parts of the tariff laws; and especially sought action from the committee and from Congress upon that part of them which regulated the importation of sugar.

Conflicting opinions, however, fostered by the ingenious reasonings of the sugar importers and refiners, made enormously rich by the growth of a business not anticipated when the law was passed, prevailed. The conflict, however, still goes on between these men and the Government.

The House of Representatives, the constitutional originator of revenue legislation, is now asked to prolong their career for another and indefinite period of dangerous and oppressive gains. It is not in the line of my argument to dwell upon the character of the proposition before the House at this time, but I will do so later in the course of my remarks.

I deem it not out of place, and indeed very proper, to quote from the last annual report of the honorable Secretary of the Treasury. He says:

A revision of the tariff seems necessary to meet the condition of many branches of trade. That condition has materially changed since the enactment of the tariff of 1864, which formed the basis of the present tariff as to most of the articles imported. The specific duties imposed by that act, for instance, on iron and steel in their various forms, had then a proper relation to the ad valorem duties imposed on the articles manufactured from those metals; but by a large reduction in the values, especially of the cruder forms of iron and steel, the specific duty imposed thereon now amounts, in many cases, to an ad valorem duty of over 100 per cent.; while the ad valorem duties on manufactured articles have not been changed. The growing demands of trade have led, also, to the importation of iron and steel in forms and under designations not enumerated in the tariff, and the great disproportion between the specific and ad valorem duties is a constant stimulus to importers to try to bring the merchandise under the ad valorem rate. This produces uncertainty, appeals from the action of collectors, and litigation, which prove embarrassing to business interests as well as to the Government; and what is instanced as the case with iron and steel will be found to be the case with other articles. An equalization of the tariff and a simplification of some of its details are needed.

The above extract from the report of the Secretary is amply sufficient for the purpose of my argument. Yet in order that I might be able to present to the House a fuller list of the articles that have caused litigations and embarrassments to the collectors of the Government, I addressed a letter to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, the tenor of which will be discovered in the following reply:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
February 18, 1882.

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, in which you request, as a basis for presenting some views to Congress in regard to a revision of the tariff, a statement of the questions which have been presented of conflicts in construction between the importers and Treasury officials in regard to the law governing the collection of duties on imports.

In reply I inclose a tabular statement which presents the questions involved in cases of the greater magnitude before this Department. It is not practicable to give you the amount involved in each class of cases thus arising. In the sugar case I think it safe to say that not less than \$1,500,000 is involved exclusive of interest and costs.

Very respectfully,

CHAS. J. FOLGER, Secretary.

HON. MARK H. DUNNELL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The honorable Secretary furnishes, as a part of his letter, a list of articles with remarks applied to each article. The articles are: measurement of ale, aniline colors, bottles, cottons, iron ore, sugars, silk and cotton goods, statuary, plaques, wool knit goods, granite, steel blooms, steel wire rods, cotton-ties, glucose or grape sugar, bone-black, steel cross ends, scrap-iron, and goat hair and cotton goods.

I will here read what he has said upon a few of these articles:

#### COTTONS.

The cotton tariff found in Schedule A is so complicated and cumbersome that it gives rise to innumerable questions. A large number of appeals have been filed under this schedule, some of which relate to the question whether certain classes of goods are goods of like description to those which are specifically named. Other questions arise in relation to whether fabrics which are irregularly woven or are open-work goods are to be considered as dutiable according to the number of threads to the square inch. The whole cotton tariff, more than any other of the tariff schedules, needs simplification and revision, and thus put an end to the embarrassing questions which now arise.

#### IRON ORE.

The Treasury Department has classified iron ore under the provision in Schedule M for mineral and bituminous substances in a crude state not otherwise provided for at the rate of 20 per cent. ad valorem. Appeals have been filed against this classification upon the ground that it is dutiable only under the provision in section 2516 for non-enumerated manufactured articles at a duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem, this claim being based in part upon the ground that iron ore is not a mineral substance but a metallic substance. The courts, however, have sustained the action of the Treasury Department.

#### SUGARS.

The action of the Treasury Department in regard to the collection of duties upon sugars is based upon the order of Mr. Secretary Sherman, of September 2, 1879, which related to sugar claimed by the officers of the Government to have been artificially colored for the purpose of evading the duty due thereon by the Dutch standard. A copy of that order is inclosed herewith. Some three hundred suits are now pending at the port of New York upon the question involved, and the claims therein amount to over one million two hundred thousand dollars, besides interest. One case was tried at New York, and the verdict was against the Government. The question was lately argued in the Supreme Court of the United States on a writ of error, and it is expected that a decision will be reached at an early day. Considering the fact that the duties on sugars collected last year amounted to \$43,000,000, or about 21 per cent. of the total revenue from customs, the importance of some plan by which disputes can be avoided, and the proper duties collected, cannot be overrated.

Of course I should state that since this letter was written to me the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the order of Secretary Sherman was illegal. As a result of this important decision not only will the Treasury be called upon to give up between one and two millions of dollars illegally collected under that order, but henceforth, if we fail to amend the law, the law regulating the importation of sugar, the flood-gates to fraud now opened will remain open until the tariff commission can report, and until in the unknown future, Congress awaiting the report of the commission, shall meet the urgent necessity.

I will make as a part of my remarks the following further portions of the letter of the Secretary:

#### SILK AND COTTON GOODS.

Under the act of February 8, 1875, (18 Stat., p. 307,) all goods made of silk, or of which silk is the component material of chief value, not otherwise named in the act, are liable to a duty of 60 per cent. ad valorem, provided they do not have as a component material 25 per cent. or over in value of cotton, flax, wool, or worsted. If the goods have over 25 per cent. in value of either of these materials they are remanded for duty to the provisions of Schedule H.

A large number of appeals have been taken on the question of fact whether goods have 25 per cent. or over of the named materials, and it seems unwise to have a double test for the classification of these goods, namely: silk, chief value, and then 25 per cent. in value of the named materials.

#### WOOL KNIT GOODS.

The question in this class of cases is whether such goods are dutiable under the provision in Schedule L, reproduced from the act of March 2, 1867, under which they have been classified by the Treasury Department both before and since the passage of the Revised Statutes, or whether they are dutiable under the provision in Schedule M for articles made on frames of whatever material composed, except silk and linen, at a duty of 35 per cent. ad valorem. One case involving the question went to the Supreme Court, which decided in favor of the lower rate of duty. The mandate was, however, subsequently stayed, and the case is now waiting a motion for permission for a reargument. It is a very important question, involving large interests to importers and to domestic manufacturers of this class of goods. This question arose out of a blunder in the Revised Statutes, which reproduced in Schedule M the paragraph referred to, and which had been repealed, so far as concerns woolen goods, by the act of 1867.

#### STEEL BLOOMS.

Schedule E, reproduced from the tariff act of 1864, provides for duties according to value on steel in ingots, bars, coils, and sheets. These duties range from 24 cents per pound to 34 cents per pound and 10 per cent. ad valorem. The first form of steel is an ingot. An ingot is cut into a number of pieces and rolled, and is then a bloom. Blooms are not named in the tariff, and it has been stated that at the time of the passage of the act of 1864 the name "blooms," as applied to steel, was not known in the United States; at all events blooms are not named in the law. The question arose in 1867 whether steel blooms were liable to the duty imposed on steel in ingots and bars, and it was held that they were not, but were dutiable under another provision in Schedule E for manufactures of steel not otherwise provided for. Against this decision appeals have been taken, based upon the ground that the article is not a manufacture of steel, but is dutiable at the rate of 30 per cent. ad valorem under the provision in Schedule E for steel in forms not otherwise provided for. It certainly is anomalous that steel in ingots, which is the first form of steel, and bars, which is a more finished form, should be assessed with the high rate of duty imposed by the tariff, while the intermediate forms of steel in blooms should be subject only to a duty of 45 per cent. ad valorem, or 30 per cent. ad valorem, which is only about one-fourth of the duty on steel in bars, according to the present prices of the materials abroad.

#### COTTON-TIES.

Schedule E imposes duties ranging from 14 to 14 cents per pound, according to width and thickness, upon band, hoop, and scroll iron. A cotton-tie is a piece of hoop iron which has been cut to the proper length of 11 feet to go around a cotton bale. In connection with the band is a buckle, designed to fasten both ends around the bale. Some of the bands as imported have the buckles riveted to the end of the band, while others have the buckle detached, to be placed on the end of the tie in the act of baling.

The question in this class of cases is whether cotton-ties are to be classified as hoop-iron, or, as claimed by the importers, as a manufacture of iron not otherwise provided for, at 35 per cent. ad valorem. Under the present decisions the cotton-ties which have the buckle permanently attached to the bands are admitted at 35 per cent. ad valorem, while the bands not having the buckle permanently attached are classified as hoop-iron. The courts have ruled against the classification of the latter as hoop-iron and in favor of 35 per cent. ad valorem; and a case involving the question is now before the Supreme Court of the United States. The minimum rate of duty on hoop-iron is 14 cent per pound, or \$28 per ton, while the duty at 35 per cent., based on present prices in England, is about \$13.50 per ton.

#### STEEL CROP ENDS.

This article is the result of the manufacture of steel rails, and consists of pieces cut off at each end to make the rails of uniform length. Some of the crop ends are very short, while others are of greater length. The shorter pieces have been generally classified as steel in forms not otherwise provided for, at a duty of 30 per

cent. ad valorem, while the longer pieces, which are adapted to many of the uses of steel in bars, have been classified as steel in bars.

The work of drawing a dividing line between the two classes has been, and continues to be, one of difficulty, and is embarrassing to merchants and to the customs officers.

#### SCRAP-IRON.

Schedule E imposes on wrought scrap-iron of every description \$8 per ton, but provides that nothing shall be deemed scrap-iron except waste or refuse iron that has been in actual use, and is fit only to be remanufactured. There are great quantities of scrap-iron, which, in the sense of the statute, have never been in use, which consist of pieces of new iron, or pieces which are left as residuum in the process of manufacture. This latter class of merchandise has been obliged to be excluded from the classification of scrap-iron, because it has never been in actual use. No reason is perceived why both classes may not properly be placed on the same footing.

#### GOAT'S HAIR AND COTTON GOODS.

Schedule L imposes upon manufactures of wool not specially enumerated a duty of 50 cents per pound, and, in addition thereto, 35 per cent. ad valorem, while upon manufactures of goat's hair the duty ranges from 20 cents per pound to 50 cents per pound, and in addition to each 35 per cent. ad valorem. Goods are imported which, it is claimed by the importers, are composed of goat's hair and cotton, without any admixture of wool, and it requires the most critical examination to decide whether the goods are as claimed or whether they are manufactured wholly or in part of wool. These cases require much care on the part of the officers of the customs, and consume great time in the settlement of the questions involved in each case.

There have been many other questions before the Department on appeal, but they have been minor ones, not of general importance, so that they are not referred to in detail here.

Here we have a reference to only a few of the articles reported in regard to the duty upon which the collection officers of the Government find daily and hourly trouble. In this statement are found reasons for the legislation which this bill has ultimately in view, and which it is my purpose to show this Congress should at once undertake. It is not as yet in argument maintained that the tariff should be revised because we are raising under it larger revenues than are needed by the Government. My attempt thus far has been to set forth sufficient reasons for its modification without making any reference to the rate of duty affixed to any single article of import. Conceding that the existing tariff has fully met the double purpose of its enactment—a supply to the national Treasury with the moneys needed to meet the wants of the Government, and protection to the manufacturing interests of our people as they might be affected in a larger or less degree by the importation of the productions of other nations; and conceding further, for the sake of argument, that the existing tariff has fully met each purpose which its framers had in view, still the reasons given for its modification are ample and well taken.

It may not be amiss, but serve a good end to give in this place the yearly receipts from customs since 1866. They are as follows:

| Year. | Receipts.        | Year. | Receipts.        |
|-------|------------------|-------|------------------|
| 1866  | \$179,046,651 58 | 1874  | \$163,103,833 69 |
| 1867  | 176,417,810 88   | 1875  | 157,107,722 35   |
| 1868  | 164,464,599 56   | 1876  | 148,071,984 61   |
| 1869  | 180,048,426 63   | 1877  | 198,159,678 02   |
| 1870  | 194,538,374 44   | 1878  | 130,956,493 07   |
| 1871  | 206,270,408 05   | 1879  | 130,170,680 20   |
| 1872  | 216,370,286 77   | 1880  | 137,250,047 70   |
| 1873  | 188,089,522 70   | 1881  | 186,522,064 60   |

But, in my opinion, the time has now come when less revenues from customs are needed by the Government. The estimated receipts for the fiscal year are \$400,000,000. The total estimated expenditures, including the sinking fund, are \$340,462,507.60, leaving an estimated surplus of \$59,537,492.55. Excluding the sinking fund, the estimated expenditures will be \$294,850,793.43, showing a surplus of \$105,149,206.57. In the above estimated expenditures for the next fiscal year is the item of \$100,000,000 for pensions. The amount called for during the next fiscal year for the sinking fund should be collected and set aside. If it is, then there will be a surplus of \$60,000,000 in round numbers. To this fact our attention has been called by the Secretary of the Treasury; and he deems the policy of purchasing in the market the 4 and 4½ per cent. bonds of doubtful propriety, and therefore discusses methods of relief. The Secretary says:

The rapid reduction of the public debt and the increase of the surplus in the Treasury present the question to Congress whether there should not be a reduction in the taxation now put upon the people. It is estimated that if the present ratio of receipts and expenditures is kept up, the public debt now existing may be paid in the next ten years. In view of the large sum that has been paid by the present generation upon that debt, and of the heavy taxation that now bears upon the industry and business of the country, it seems just and proper that another generation should meet a portion of the debt, and that the burdens now laid upon the country should be lightened.

It is to be considered, too, whether the teeming affluence of the Treasury does not provoke to expenditure larger in amount than a wise economy would permit and upon objects that would not meet with favor in a pinched or moderate condition of the national exchequer. In some quarters there is already talk of an "overflowing Treasury;" and projects are put forth for lavish expenditure not only to the furtherance of public works of doubtful legitimacy and expediency, but in aid of enterprises no more than quasi public in character. Can a government be justly said to have an overflowing treasury when there is an outstanding debt against it greater than it could pay, if lawfully presented, and when its means of payment in the future must be taken from its denizens by burdensome taxation? And is it a beneficent exercise of governmental power to raise money by taxation in greater sums than the lawful demands upon the government require, when those demands are of themselves a heavy burden upon the industry and business of the country?

The condition of the Treasury, the increase of the surplus in it, does not in my opinion constitute the only argument for a reduction

of tariff rates. A weighty argument is found in the rates themselves. Upon some articles of importation we raise altogether too much revenue; from others we raise far too little. I shall now enumerate some articles the present rate of duty upon which should be reduced; and shall maintain that a reduction can be made with no damage or even an approach of damage to the home industry or interest. This enumeration which I now propose to read is not made wholly to show that the duties are too high but in part for the purposes of illustration further on in my remarks:

#### BLANKETS.

Blankets, when valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, pay a duty of 20 cents per pound and 35 per cent. additional. The average ad valorem rate of duty has been, for the last year, 76.63. The whole amount of revenue collected from this class of blankets for the last year was only \$238.56. The average ad valorem rate of duty upon the second class was 90.49 and naturally the amount collected was but \$79.74. Upon blankets of the third class the duty is 40 cents per pound and 35 per cent. additional. The average ad valorem rate of duty has been 98.91 and the amount collected \$258.50. The next two classes pay a duty of 50 cents per pound and 35 per cent. additional. The average ad valorem rate of duty in one case was 71.50 and in the other 85. In the latter of the two classes the amount collected was but \$17, and in the other only \$898.65. The entire amount of duty collected for the last fiscal year on blankets was \$1,452.10.

#### FLANNELS.

Flannels are put into five classes for the collection of duties. The first class is then valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, with a rate of duty at 20 cents per pound and 35 per cent. additional. The average ad valorem rate of duty was 95 and the sum of 95 cents was brought into the Treasury. The average rate of duty upon the second class of flannels has been 102.60; of the third class, 95.68; of the fourth class, 65.43, and of the fifth class, 65.45. The amount collected during the last fiscal year was but \$16,130.81.

#### HATS.

Hats, when valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, pay a duty of 30 cents per pound and 35 per cent. additional. The average ad valorem rate of duty for the last year upon this class was 93.90 and the amount collected was \$4.31. The average ad valorem rate of duty upon the second class was 96.63, and the amount collected \$47.21. The average ad valorem rate of duty of the third class of hats was 58.22 and the amount collected for the fiscal year on all the classes was \$599.34. The mean average ad valorem rate of duty upon these three classes of goods, needed in every family in the land, has been 83.62, approaching 100 per cent.

Gentlemen may anticipate, and reasonably, the use to which I may put these figures before I close; for if protection to be such must work prohibition, then these citations will be very apt illustrations of duties laid for revenue, but which are substantially prohibitory, and hence yield little or no revenue. These duties, as will be seen, actually destroy or render impossible any competition between the home and foreign producer. This may be all very satisfactory to the home producer, but is not so to the consumer.

#### THE MANUFACTURES OF SILK.

The manufactures of silk, embracing braids, laces, fringes, galloons, buttons and ornaments, dress and piece goods, floss, hats, caps, and bonnets, hosiery, pongees and vestings, ready-made clothing, and ribbons, have paid an average ad valorem rate of duty from 60 down to 35 per cent., a mean average of 56.50, while the mean average duty upon blankets, flannels, and hats has been 83.63. I was educated in the belief that duties should, as far as possible, be higher upon articles purchased by the rich or by the few and lower upon those needed by all, and consequently by the poor. The present tariff does not now so appear. If it was originally so constructed, then its present operation furnishes the best possible argument for its reconstruction.

#### SUGAR.

I call the attention of the committee to the large amount of revenues derived from sugar, molasses, and melada during the last fiscal year. The Secretary of the Treasury makes the following statement in his last annual report:

The duties connected with sugar, molasses, and melada during the past fiscal year amount to \$47,997,137, or nearly one-quarter of the whole amount of our revenues from customs. The difficulties attending the collection of these duties have largely occupied the attention of committees of Congress during several past years. The Dutch standard of color as applied to the apparent color of imported sugars is no longer a test of the saccharine strength or value for refining purposes.

Aside from the facts given in the above extract, which alone constitute an argument for an early revision of the tariff, I allude to the subject of sugar, and insist that the amount of revenues collected from it is wholly disproportionate to the whole amount collected. Sugar is an article of universal consumption. It comes to the tables of the poor as well as the rich, and, indeed, to the former in greater proportion than to the latter. It is made to pay into the Treasury nearly one-quarter of the whole amount of our revenues from customs. It cannot be contended that the large protection which is furnished by the present tariff is needed by the producers of sugar in this country. The rates under the Dutch standard of color are as follows: 1½ cents per pound plus 24 per cent. per pound on sugar not above No. 7; 2 cents plus 25 per cent. on sugar above No. 7 and not above No. 10; 2½ cents plus 25 per cent. on sugar above No. 10 and not above No. 13; 2½ cents plus 24 per cent. per pound on sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 26; 3½ cents plus 25 per cent. per pound on sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20; and 4 cents plus 25 per cent. per pound on sugar above No. 20. The total amount of sugar imported the last year for consumption was 1,839,173,097.50 pounds, valued at the ports of shipment at \$82,725,087.27. The duties were \$45,933,045.09, or a fraction above 54 per cent. ad valorem. The amount collected the last year exceeds the amount received the preceding year by \$6,825,788.74, while the increase of duties on total



entries for consumption was but \$11,052,226.12, so that about 62 per cent. of the increase on all duties came from sugar.

#### THE FREE LIST.

Many articles not produced in this country now paying a high rate of duty should be carried to the free list. The spices now pay duties equivalent to an ad valorem duty from 34 per cent. to 780 per cent. Spices paid an aggregate duty last year of \$1,124,532.48.

#### DIAMONDS.

When it is remembered how high the duties are on articles of common consumption, and to which I have alluded, it will appear curious that diamonds "not set" pay under this tariff only 10 per cent.

If reductions in taxes are to be made—and I contend that they may be and should be—and to the amount of \$60,000,000, from what sources can one-fifth or one-fourth, or indeed one-third, of these come so well as from a reduction in the duties on this article of prime necessity?

In England there is no duty on sugar. Sugar costs there half its present price here. The consumption of sugar in England is about 69 pounds per capita, and in this country about 38 pounds per capita. This article of prime necessity and healthfulness is kept away from the laboring people of this country—is kept away from the masses by this enormous tax upon the raw material.

With all due respect to gentlemen who argue in favor of a commission, I dislike the commission because it puts off these adjustments that are pressing upon us every hour. I insist that this Congress ought to revise the sugar tariff. I respectfully maintain that the Committee on Ways and Means during the last ninety days should have busied itself in revising the sugar and other portions of the tariff. Instead of that, in an evil hour, in my judgment, it listened to arguments favoring a commission, and its members one by one yielded to them. What is this commission? It is to consist of nine men selected from civil life. They will be selected as the representatives of interests, or they will be experts in certain industries. It will be their labor, under the law, to collect data touching the various industries indicated in the bill. The reports will come to us in December and possibly not till January in the next session. No matter how valuable the reports may be they will come to us too late for use. If we pass this bill the Forty-seventh Congress will, in my opinion, fail to witness any changes in our revenue laws.

I become impatient when told that we need a tariff commission in order that we may have tariff revision. I cannot suppose for a moment that there are many men in this House who believe that the Forty-seventh Congress will do anything on the tariff other than turn over to the Forty-eighth Congress a collected mass of material, out of which possibly a tariff might be drawn. Each Congress has its own peculiar and distinctive character. It has its own way of thinking and acting, and the Forty-eighth Congress will care but little what the Forty-seventh Congress did. It will not be this Congress; it will be another body. Many men who are here to-day will not be in that Congress. One-half of our number may be returned, perhaps less. There will be a new Committee on Ways and Means and a new organization.

That Congress will not care to consider the methods of this Congress or be governed by its action on this subject. It will know that we avoided the labor of revision; that we had not the pluck, the force, or the courage to do what was in front of us and what was demanded of us. I am not a believer in the doctrine that a party gains anything by shirking a present responsibility. I insist, sir, that the other side of the House lost control of this House because it did not redeem its promises upon the tariff and other questions. It went out of power largely because it did not do what it had promised. We have reached a period in politics and legislation in this country when parties cannot live by ideas or principles resting on mere sentiment; we have got beyond the period of the war. We ought to realize that we are now in a period where progressive legislation is demanded. We ought not as Republicans to let the Forty-seventh Congress die, as did the Forty-sixth, with a record of non-action.

The Republicans of this House may reasonably ask what they have done so far in this session. It is not the province of this Congress to help the Forty-eighth Congress do its duty. The Forty-seventh Congress has a specific duty to perform, and one of its duties is a modification of the tariff, not on any declared basis which individuals may lay down, but such a one as is demanded by the interests of the country. Drive out of your Federal courts your twenty-three hundred tariff cases pending there. Let the Secretary have plain sailing when he attempts to administer the revenue laws of the country. Let this House say to the Executive Department "We will no longer withhold facilities in the execution of the revenue laws."

In further illustration of the operation of our revenue laws, let me ask attention to another article of common consumption.

#### RICE.

The great bulk of the rice imported into the United States comes in as cleaned and uncleaned. The former pays a duty of 2½ cents per pound and the latter 2 cents per pound. During the last fiscal year there were imported of these two classes 42,162,200 pounds, valued at \$1,000,756.68, paying a duty of \$1,052,283.26. The average ad valorem rate of duty, as can be easily seen by calculation, is 105 per cent., the rice therefore costing less at the places of shipment than

the duty paid upon it. The following figures are taken from a recent report of the Rice Association of Savannah:

| Years.   | Domestic production. | Total consumption. |
|----------|----------------------|--------------------|
|          | Pounds.              | Pounds.            |
| 1865-'66 | 11,592,600           | 62,362,280         |
| 1866-'67 | 12,206,729           | 76,851,823         |
| 1867-'68 | 14,602,000           | 53,314,734         |
| 1868-'69 | 26,790,200           | 70,947,911         |
| 1869-'70 | 53,957,000           | 95,900,697         |
| 1870-'71 | 47,348,000           | 73,126,092         |
| 1871-'72 | 39,625,990           | 93,633,048         |
| 1872-'73 | 52,634,400           | 114,621,237        |
| 1873-'74 | 62,900,380           | 126,176,194        |
| 1874-'75 | 68,241,400           | 115,099,317        |
| 1875-'76 | 72,360,800           | 119,145,857        |
| 1876-'77 | 81,391,800           | 135,903,047        |
| 1877-'78 | 77,240,400           | 125,462,837        |
| 1878-'79 | 84,739,200           | 121,941,380        |
| 1879-'80 | 86,996,800           | 135,389,719        |
| 1880-'81 | 117,766,000          | 175,535,691        |

The difference in these columns for each year will give the amount imported. The following extract from this report, wholly devoted to a defense of the rates of duty, is here submitted:

The duty on cleaned rice had been raised in 1862 to 14 cent per pound. In 1864 it was again increased to 2½ cents per pound, and so remains unchanged.

This duty was imposed in time of war, but why may it not be continued in time of peace? In time of war it was contributory to the cost of the war, but it was also a tax on a foreign monopoly. In time of peace it remains a tax on a foreign imported commodity undiminished in volume and contributory to the maintenance of the Government in undiminished amount, while it is a necessary prevention against the re-establishment of a foreign monopoly, and a protection alike to the American producer and consumer.

The duty before 1862 was 20 per cent. ad valorem. The home production in 1850 was 215,313,097 pounds; home consumption, 147,313,097, leaving 68,000,000 for exportation. In 1860, the production was 187,167,032 pounds; home consumption, 111,794,032, leaving for export 75,373,000 pounds. Before 1862 the duty was 20 per cent. ad valorem; now it is equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 105 per cent. I fail to discover in the statistics given any good reason for the continuance of a war tax so very much in excess of the old rate of duty upon an article of such universal use, and the changed conditions of labor in the rice-producing States do not seem equal to this great difference in duties. Tariff experts may find that the present duty is just as it should be, but I am unable to convince myself that it is.

Mr. KELLEY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DUNNELL. In a moment.

Mr. KELLEY. I desire to ask the gentleman whether the increase in the ad valorem rate of duty on rice is not the result of the fall in the price of the commodity under the duty?

Mr. DUNNELL. I do not—

Mr. KELLEY. Let me state further that there has been no change in the rate of duty.

Mr. DUNNELL. I do not understand the matter as the gentleman does.

Mr. KELLEY. How, then, has the ad valorem rate changed? The fact is that the duty is the same.

Mr. DUNNELL. It is not now an ad valorem rate. It is now a specific rate, but this estimate is on the ad valorem basis. The average duty, if it were an ad valorem, would be 105 per cent.; that is, the present specific duty is equivalent to an ad valorem of 105 per cent.

Mr. KELLEY. Has not the ad valorem increased under the specific duty by the diminished price of the commodity? We paid 15 cents a pound for rice and we now buy it for 4 or 5.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota allow me to ask a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. KELLEY?]

Does he say the price of rice is less than it was anterior to the war? Mr. KELLEY. No, sir; we were exporting rice before the war. But at the close of the war we were paying 16 or 17 cents a pound; and the gentleman from South Carolina can tell us what the price is now; I think it is 4 or 5 cents. And I do not see that a duty which reduces the price of a commodity 75 per cent. is a burden to the consumer.

Mr. MORRISON. You never saw such a duty anywhere.

Mr. DUNNELL. When the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has his hour, I trust he will answer me, if I am incorrect in my position.

Mr. KELLEY. I will endeavor to do so.

#### MANUFACTURES OF IRON.

Mr. DUNNELL. I come now to the manufactures of iron.

It would be easy to make a long list of the manufactures of iron, giving the rates of duty imposed upon the various articles, which would most clearly demonstrate that rates fixed when the law was made are now wholly unreasonable, and in many instances absolutely oppressive. They have become unanswerable arguments in favor of modification and reduction. They suggest the arguments for reduction which the honest and intelligent protectionist would himself adopt.

The duty on cut nails and spikes is 1½ cents per pound. The amount

imported was valued at \$242.63. The duties collected were \$127.18. The rates on the two classes of cut tacks and brads are 2½ and 3 cents per pound. The amount imported was valued at \$33, and \$16.66 were the duties collected. Cast-iron butts and hinges have a duty of 2½ cents per pound. Chains, trace, halter, and fence, bear a duty of 2½ cents per pound, 3 cents, and 35 per cent. Horseshoe nails bear a duty of 5 cents per pound. The Treasury received \$20 the last year on 400 pounds. The above rates cannot be defended. The collections are substantially nothing; showing that the rates are well-nigh prohibitory. They render competition impossible. The producer is so protected that the consumer is wholly at his mercy. As already stated, the list could be a long one. The above is sufficient for my purpose.

#### MANUFACTURES OF STEEL.

Under this heading I shall have time to do no more than refer to steel rails, and indicate some of the ill effects of the present high rate of duty upon steel. The following extract is from the Bulletin of February 15, 1882:

In the following table we give the statistics of the annual production of steel rails in the United States since the commencement of their manufacture, together with the average annual price at which they have been sold and the rates of duty imposed on foreign rails. The yearly price has been obtained by averaging the monthly prices.

| Year. | Product, in gross tons. | Price, in currency. | Duty.                    |
|-------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1867  | 2,277                   | \$166 00            | 45 per cent. ad valorem. |
| 1868  | 6,541                   | 158 50              |                          |
| 1869  | 8,616                   | 132 25              |                          |
| 1870  | 30,357                  | 106 75              |                          |
| 1871  | 34,152                  | 102 50              |                          |
| 1872  | 83,991                  | 112 00              | \$28 per ton.            |
| 1873  | 115,192                 | 120 50              |                          |
| 1874  | 129,414                 | 94 25               |                          |
| 1875  | 259,699                 | 68 75               |                          |
| 1876  | 368,269                 | 59 25               |                          |
| 1877  | 385,865                 | 45 50               |                          |
| 1878  | 491,427                 | 42 25               |                          |
| 1879  | 606,397                 | 48 33               |                          |
| 1880  | 852,196                 | 67 50               |                          |
| 1881  | 1,200,000               | 61 13               |                          |

The steel-rail mills of this country can this year produce fully 1,500,000 gross tons of steel rails if that quantity should be needed. We do not need to import a ton of steel rails to-day to meet the present demand, and as a matter of fact indications point to an early virtual termination of all importations of both steel and iron rails.

I shall allude further to this extract when I allude to some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. RUSSELL.]

The duty of \$28 per ton on steel rails was fixed in 1870. It is not my purpose to discuss whether the duty was then too high or what effect the rate has had in reducing the cost of rails, but insist that a continuance of this high duty is well-nigh a crime. During the last year 372,375,307 tons of steel rails were imported into the United States, paying an aggregate revenue of \$4,654,691.31. Steel rails are now made at about the same cost of iron rails. The above table shows the growth and capacity of the mills. The profits of these mills have been for the last few years simply enormous. The census returns show that they were in 1880 from 60 to 70 per cent. on the entire investment. Every person traveling upon a railroad or sending a pound of freight on it is compelled to contribute to these vast profits. This high rate can and should be reduced at once. Experts are not needed to decide so simple a question. A large manufacturer of Bessemer steel rails in Saint Louis, within the last sixty days, assured me that the duty could be reduced to \$14 per ton and the manufacturers still realize large profits on their investments. Enhanced cost in the construction of the railroads of the country is a continuing burden upon the producer. All profits must be paid for by somebody. Reasonable profits are right and rightly fostered, but profits which create and sustain monopolies have no claim upon legislation for their continuance. It would be easy to show these profits. The production in 1881 was 1,200,000 tons.

Permit me just here to say that when we look this steel question fairly in the face we can find no possible reason for the continuance of this large duty of \$28 per ton. Nearly four hundred millions of tons of steel rails were imported into the United States during the last year, notwithstanding this high rate of duty. No interest which has been fostered by the Government till the annual profits on the investment range from 60 to 70 per cent. has any right to ask for any further time. Such profits are dangerous. They are unhealthy. The steel-rail manufacturers are loudest in their demands for a commission. A commission pleases them. It gives them more time to continue the burden upon the movers of our vast internal commerce by rail.

I do not wonder that every steel magazine printed in the city of Philadelphia is out in favor of a tariff commission. These fellows are bright; they are smart, and they are as impudent as they are smart. They ask us to continue a monopoly by a twenty-eight-dollar per ton tariff, which enables them to declare a dividend of 67 per cent. [Mr. KELLEY rose.] I cannot be interrupted.

Mr. KELLEY. I affirm—

Mr. DUNNELL. I say I cannot be interrupted.

Mr. KELLEY. That for five years they received no dividends.

Mr. DUNNELL. Not simply do these large profits go into the coffers of these manufacturing companies but their influence runs down into every district in this country. In my own State and in the great West thousands of miles of railroad are to be built next year. If upon each ton of iron or steel rails there is an unnecessary burden of \$20, what will be the effect of that increased cost on all these miles of railroad? That increased cost must be paid by somebody. The producers of the cereals of the West must pay for that increased expense.

We raise in Minnesota, and either ship in its unmanufactured form or manufacture it into flour and ship it, 30,000,000 bushels of wheat. That large volume of products must find its way to the East. Shall it be carried over steel rails that cost \$60 per ton, or may it not travel over rails that shall not cost over \$45 per ton? The Canada Pacific Railroad is being built with steel rails at a cost of \$32 to \$35 per ton, while the Northern Pacific is paying \$30 per ton. The difference between these costs must be paid for by somebody, and the men who reap these large profits, and not the producers, are asking for this tariff commission—not an organ of the steel interest in this country but is asking for the tariff commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TUCKER. I move that the time of the gentleman be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. For how long?

Mr. DUNNELL. Say thirty minutes.

Mr. TUCKER. Indefinitely, as it has been done for other members.

Mr. RANDALL. That means an hour.

There was no objection, and the time of the gentleman was extended indefinitely.

#### INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXATION.

Mr. DUNNELL. The tariff-commission bill, as referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, contained a clause submitting to the commission our internal-revenue system. This clause was struck out by the committee. The bill providing for a tariff commission which has just passed the Senate does contain a reference of the internal-revenue taxation. Bills are pending in this House providing for a repeal of all internal taxation, and also for a reduction of the duties now imposed upon spirits, tobacco, cigars, and malt liquors.

Internal Revenue Commissioner Raum recently appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and gave the losses to the Treasury which would follow certain proposed reductions in rates of taxation. He said:

The receipts from spirits the last year upon the gallon tax amounted to something over \$60,000,000; the receipts of the first six months of the current year show an increase of \$1,608,000; so that it would be perfectly safe to assume \$63,000,000 as the basis of our calculations. That being the basis and 90 cents being the tax, a reduction of 10 cents on the gallon would be equivalent to a reduction of \$7,000,000. A reduction of the tax to 75 cents a gallon would reduce the revenue about \$10,500,000; and a reduction of the tax to 60 cents would make a reduction of \$21,000,000, and a reduction to 50 cents would make a reduction in taxation of \$28,000,000.

The Commissioner further replied to the committee that if the tax on tobacco be reduced from 16 cents per pound to 12 cents, the amount received from tobacco would be reduced \$5,875,000; and if reduced to 10 cents the loss to the Treasury would be \$8,812,000. The reduction of the tax on cigars from \$6 to \$5 per thousand would cause a reduction in receipts of \$2,666,000, and if reduced to \$4 per thousand a loss to the Treasury of \$5,332,000. If the present tax on malt liquors be reduced from the present rate to 80 cents per barrel, it would cause a reduction of revenues to the amount of \$2,650,000, and if reduced to 60 cents per barrel, to \$5,300,000. The reduction of revenue would thus be as follows: on distilled spirits, at 75 cents per gallon, \$10,500,000; on malt liquors, 80 cents per barrel, \$2,252,000; tobacco, 12 cents per pound, \$5,875,000; cigars, \$5 per thousand, \$2,666,000; a total reduction of \$21,293,000. If the reduction be calculated on the basis of the greater scale of reduction proposed, the result would be as follows: on distilled spirits, at 50 cents per gallon, \$28,000,000; on malt liquors, at 60 cents per barrel, \$5,114,000; on tobacco, at 10 cents per pound, \$8,812,000; on cigars, at \$4 per thousand, \$5,332,000. A grand total of reduction in receipts on the above scales of \$47,158,000.

Bills are pending for reducing taxation upon spirits, malt liquors, and tobacco upon the above scales. In my opinion they will soon be before us for discussion and action. If they shall pass, the \$47,158,000 will go far toward wiping out the surplus of \$60,000,000 heretofore alluded to.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his report to this Congress, when referring to the income from the tax on spirits, malt liquors, and tobacco, said:

The tax on these articles is a tax on the appetite, on indulgences, legitimate subjects of taxation when taxation is enforced. A reduction of the tax is not recommended.

With this opinion of the Secretary, Mr. Chairman, I most cordially agree. I here enter my protest against a reduction of the internal-revenue resources of this Government, in the absence of any effort or declared purpose to secure any reduction in customs duties. If this Congress proposes deliberately to reduce the tariff revenue tax on whisky from 90 cents a gallon to 75 cents, or 60 cents, or 50 cents, and at the same time declares its purpose to put off and indefinitely postpone a reduction of the tariff upon the necessities of life, then I simply proclaim my purpose to take no part or lot in the play. If the tariff is to remain unchanged upon all those articles to which I



have made allusion—flannels, blankets, shawls, hats, the manufactures of iron and of steel, upon rice and sugar, articles called for and needed by the laboring people of the country, bearing to-day a higher ad valorem rate of duty than the luxuries which wealth imports; and if there is to be a reduction of taxation upon those articles of consumption which are justly denominated luxuries, whose use tends not to the enrichment but to the impoverishment of the people, then we shall do a work which the people will not indorse.

I should not have referred to the internal-revenue laws were they not involved in this proposed action of Congress. Certain leading journals, devoted to special interests, are daily and weekly urging upon Congress the passage of this bill. These journals now admit that the rates imposed by the tariff are too high; they never admit or hint at a reduction of duty on any single article named in the schedule; but while they concede that the tariff should be revised, they call for a complete abolition of the internal-revenue system.

The estimated receipts from this system for the next year are \$157,000,000. How would the loss of this large amount affect us? It would work incalculable injury. We should have no anxiety about any surplus; our trouble would be to find out a way to keep good the sinking fund and supply a still further deficiency of sixty millions. A policy which should make inevitable an annual increase of the public debt for whose reduction we have borne heavy burdens for the last fifteen and more years, would not tend to perpetuate the dominant party of this House. Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, that this policy is advocated that tariff rates may be increased? That would be absolutely necessary if our public credit is to be kept as good as it now is.

We now raise this large sum from admitted luxuries. If our aggregate revenues are beyond the demands of the Government, which will be fully admitted, then let the reduction come from the necessities of life. Even the consumers of these luxuries would so decide, if it were submitted to them. The distillers and wholesale dealers in spirits and tobacco are alone asking for this reduction. I would be very unwilling to go home to my constituents and tell them that I had voted to make whisky and tobacco cheaper for them, and confess that I had failed to vote for a reduction of duties upon articles daily needed by them; that I had voted for cheaper whisky upon my own judgment, but decided to refer the questions of cheaper clothing and food to a committee of experts.

It is estimated that the receipts from internal revenue for next year will be \$157,000,000. There is now pending here a bill which will reduce that amount by about \$19,000,000; so that if the present tax remains upon malt beer, tobacco, and whisky, the amount to be received from internal revenue the next year will be about \$140,000,000.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SPEER] yesterday dwelt very eloquently upon the destructiveness of our present internal-revenue system. He told the committee that Edith Ellen Foster had said that she was in favor of wiping out the whole system of internal-revenue taxes.

I fail to see how the cause of temperance, for whose advancement this lady labors, can be particularly promoted by repealing the tax upon whisky. It would make whisky cheaper to the producer and so increase the consumption. A repeal of the law upon the tax would also tend to increase the relative proportion of poor whisky.

It is easy for me, Mr. Chairman, to anticipate the reply which will be made to the views which I have thus far expressed. It will be admitted in the arguments of gentlemen favoring this bill that the tariff should be revised; that the tariff commission means that, and that it means a systematic revision. I have not objected to the commission wholly because of its character, though it has never before been resorted to in tariff legislation during our entire national history, but my chief objections to it have been and are now because it must postpone and indefinitely postpone what should be done now.

My friend from Rhode Island, [Mr. CHACE,] who accosted me so pleasantly yesterday as "friend Mark," said to me that the English Government resorts to commissions. That may be true; but not in the manner and to the extent proposed by the bill under consideration. A commission there investigates a single subject, or certainly a very few compared with the number which must come before a commission in this country, charged with all the work marked out in the bill before us.

It must be conceded that our revenue laws need amendment, else this bill has no business to consume our time and attention. An issue is, shall these amendments be discovered by this House, through its constituted Committee on Ways and Means and through the House itself, or shall these amendments be suggested to us by men outside of Congress and in no sense responsible to the people? The appointing power will be singularly fortunate if some of these men do not in some manner find themselves serving interests which they think at least were exerted for their selection. The framers of the Constitution conceived reasons for conferring upon the House of Representatives the formation of revenue bills. Gentlemen devoted to a study of the laws of exchange, of values, and of trade may by their exclusive devotion to the reason and philosophy of these laws be wonderfully unsuited to the collection of facts, which at last must come before Congress for examination, and from which the desired bill must be taken. Scientific experts are not always practical men.

The members of this House are amenable to the Constitution, and

responsible to constituencies. The Constitution imposes upon the House of Representatives all revenue measures; this is because its members are representatives of the people and their interests. The nine men appointed under this bill, if it becomes a law, will be burdened with no such sense of responsibility; they will be the cold collectors of facts; they will have a record to make of the facts collected, and a report to submit. When they have done this their work will end. They are not called on to formulate a bill. That will be left for a Committee on Ways and Means. This committee, in the absence of the witnesses furnishing the facts, will be but the readers of facts which other men have brought together. In the reports the members of this committee will readily discover the bias of the witnesses. The commissioners have gone to their homes, and these reports will furnish but little aid in the preparation of the bill.

Admitting that an argument may be found in behalf of a commission, yet my objection to it remains. I am opposed to a postponement of tariff legislation because it is a work which should be done now. I have already read a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury which alone furnishes all the reasons for immediate action, which the legislative branch of the Government has no right to neglect. Let me here read two and a half lines from the last annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury. They are as follows:

On the 1st of July, 1881, 2,376 suits against the collectors of customs—nearly all for a refund of customs duties—were pending in the United States courts of New York.

In the face of this startling announcement and the other official statements concerning the practical working of the revenue laws, giving rise to innumerable disputes and vexatious suits, it is deliberately proposed to refer these laws to a commission, whose report at best will not come to us till the beginning of the next short session of Congress. That report must be voluminous; it will consist of four, five, six, or seven volumes of printed matter. The different schools of tariff economy must be represented on the commission, or its findings will be rejected as one-sided. I am not among the number who believe that a tariff bill can be taken from these reports, brought before the House, and passed during a session which, as experience has always shown, is scarcely sufficient in length for the passage of the appropriation bills.

Are we at liberty, Mr. Chairman, so to manage that this work shall go over to the Forty-eighth or some subsequent Congress? We shall, in my opinion, justly merit and receive the censure of the people if we so vote. It would be impolitic and unwise; it would be unpatriotic and dangerous to the interests which changed duties might affect. When the right time for action comes it is dangerous to delay. The interests involved are put in jeopardy by such a course. A revision of the tariff was rightly expected of this Congress by the country, and it is our duty to make it.

We are told, sir, by some gentlemen who advocate the passage of this bill that we have now no time. If I had advice to give to the dominant side of the House, in view of the expectations of the country and an approaching Presidential election, I would say to it, "Bring in a tariff bill, if it contain no more than six lines; bring it in here, if it consists of but one item; bring it in here that we may correct one at least of the hundred sources of embarrassment in the collections of the revenue." This would be my advice. I do not claim that I have any authority to give advice. My service of eleven years in this House has given me some experience, or at least afforded me some opportunities for observation. I am very clear that when the people gave the Republican party control of this House they expected something from it.

If we put off to the uncertain future a revision of the tariff laws of the country, when we go back to the people we will find it difficult to satisfy them that we did our duty simply by referring it to a commission of experts, who will owe responsibility neither to them nor to us.

Let me ask attention of the committee for a few minutes to an extract from a speech delivered by the late President Garfield in this House in 1870. The President used this language in 1870:

After studying the whole subject as carefully as I am able, I am firmly of the opinion that the wisest thing that the protectionists in this House can do is to unite in a moderate reduction of duties on imported articles. He is not a faithful representative who merely votes for the highest rate proposed in order to show on the record that he voted for the highest figure, and therefore is a sound protectionist. He is the wisest man who sees the tides and currents of public opinion and uses his best efforts to protect the industry of the people against sudden collapses and sudden changes. Now, if I do not misunderstand the signs of the times, unless we do this ourselves, prudently and wisely, we shall before long be compelled to submit to a violent reduction, made rudely and without discrimination, which will shock, if not shatter, all our protected industries.

These words would have had their fulfillment had not this House in 1872 yielded to a reduction which in this speech he proclaimed it must do.

Mr. KELLEY. No reduction was made in 1872.

Mr. DUNNELL. I do not yield. A reduction was made two years later.

Mr. MORRISON. Ten per cent. was taken off.

Mr. DUNNELL. It is very hard for interests declaring enormous dividends to act wisely. They are deaf to the voice of the people. They will not yield till obliged to do so. It is the part of statesmanship to protect every interest. That cannot be done when certain interests, becoming arrogant through great and dangerous gains, dictate how and when it shall be done. Certain interests in the country made immensely remunerative by a large protection too long con-

tinued have become exacting beyond measure. They demand a tariff commission, and denounce every man who entertains an honest conviction that they should be willing to accept honest profits and allow the people to have some share in the benefits of the interests which their Representatives have enabled them to build up.

I was this morning not a little amazed by some utterances found in the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] made here yesterday. He said in his speech:

There is no protection in a strictly revenue tariff—that is, to an American manufacture; for if a revenue is to be derived from an imported article it must be imported, which certainly involves its manufacture elsewhere, and the rate of duty must be so fixed as to invite its importation. Therefore a tariff cannot be adjusted on a single article to serve the double purpose of revenue and protection. It must either be at a point to check importation and thus protect, or it must be at a point low enough to admit importation and thus produce a revenue. That is, when fixed at a revenue point it ceases to protect, and when fixed at a protective point it ceases to yield a revenue.

If the gentleman is correct, then the duties laid on blankets, flannels, hats, and the manufactures of iron alluded to by me a few moments since are not quite high enough for protection, for we do collect a few dollars on them. The gentleman is greatly in error. He will not deny that \$28 per ton on steel rails furnishes a good, fair protection, since statistics show that the manufacturers in 1880 made 66 per cent. clean profit on their investment. Notwithstanding this, we collected some \$4,000,000 revenue from imported steel rails. If the duty had been \$14 per ton our revenues would have been larger, and still the home producers would have realized profits far beyond an average return on like investments. Enormously large revenues are received from sugar, and certainly no one will claim that our home producers are not protected by the duties imposed. It would be very easy to find other articles in the tariff laws, as they are, where we fully protect and yet obtain reasonable revenues. If every American manufacturer must be protected by so large a duty as to prevent importation, it will be difficult to see where our revenues are to come from.

If we prohibit importation we must give a monopoly to the home producer of the article which we prohibit; we utterly destroy competition, the only regulator of prices. Let me here quote another sentence from the speech of the late President Garfield. He said:

I hold that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best gauge by which to regulate international trade. Duties should be so high that our manufactures can fairly compete with the foreign products, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy a monopoly of the trade, and regulate the price as they please.

I accept the doctrines taught by that extract. I do not go beyond them. He became the Republican candidate for President and was elected. He never took back the above declaration. Henry Clay, for whom I cast my first vote for President in 1844, never went beyond that, and never hinted at the extreme doctrine now advocated, that protection and revenue cannot be obtained at one and the same time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] put it in these words:

Therefore a tariff cannot be adjusted on a single article to serve the double purpose of revenue and protection.

There is a radical difference between the sentence just quoted and that last given from the speech of Garfield.

The only protection which is rational and which the American people will long consent to is that which lets the American producer have the lead, have the advantage in the race. If the home producer has that, he has all he has any right to ask for. Duties are laid for purposes of revenue. If the Government in laying them gives a just and safe advantage to our own people, it should be called upon to do no more. The existing tariff in very many articles goes far beyond this. I am not among the number who would strike at a single American industry. Rather, I say, let them all live; let them all flourish; let them all yield good honest returns and declare like dividends. But when I am asked to refer to a commission and so indefinitely postpone reductions in rates, such as the steel rail rates, I am asked to be an upholder of a terrible monopoly, I am indeed asked to commit a crime. I am asked to put and continue burdens upon all the agricultural products of the nation. These products constitute the chief bulk of our internal commerce. Every bushel of grain seeking a market cries out against it. [Mr. RUSSELL rose.] I cannot now yield. Unreasonable gains, Mr. Chairman, are not healthy to the body politic. Enormous profits debauch, enormous incomes corrupt. They will not let Congress alone. They want delay if their continuance may be affected by legislation. It is no good sign of the times that there are throughout the country men and interests not satisfied with good, healthy, reasonable returns. They want enormous profits and crave colossal fortunes. Such fortunes, in no small degree, are made by the people, but not for them. They drain, too often, the sources of individual prosperity. Somebody must pay the cost of them. The consumer must pay, if not always, very often. I do not understand, therefore, that I am called upon to keep on certain articles such a rate of duty as will build up these fortunes. But, sir, a single sentence upon another point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the gentleman will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. DUNNELL. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for calling attention to the protective features of the speech which I made

yesterday. I contended yesterday as I contend to-day, that the most effectual way to produce cheap commodities in this country is to build up domestic manufactures. And the gentleman from Minnesota, as other gentlemen, may be able to light upon a single individual enterprise at a single specific time and show that if the tariff is removed from that specific article we would have for a time a cheaper commodity. But I contend, in the light of events and of the facts around me, that we shall have cheaper commodities by protecting our domestic industries. Now the gentleman from Minnesota has referred to blankets. I desire to show him in that connection—

Mr. DUNNELL. Mr. Chairman, I have made no allusion whatever to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts, except to read the words which I have read; and he has no right to interpolate an argument in my speech sustaining his position of yesterday, unless it be specifically with reference to the words which I have quoted.

I will simply ask the attention of the committee, in closing, to our duty here at the present time. I perhaps have already anticipated what I had intended to say at the close of my remarks.

I believe in the Republican party, and desire to see it behave well. I desire to see it act wisely, discreetly, and reasonably. I have been with it ever since it was born, and have gone along with it through its history. I do not believe, however, that the party, with all of its goodness, with all its grand record, can hold a place upon this side of the House, or a majority place, unless it deserves it by action. The Republican party in the Forty-third Congress slaughtered itself. I was present on that occasion. It was slaughtered one night—slaughtered in the house of its friends; and it went out of power, and the Forty-fourth Congress was Democratic.

The loss of this House by the Republicans in the elections of 1874 was as logical in its result as that effects will follow causes. It was not in the power of man to avert the result which overtook it.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota to be explicit, and to tell us—

Mr. DUNNELL. No, I cannot yield. The gentleman must excuse me. I am alone responsible for my statements, and do not care to enter into any further explanation. I have stated that the Republican party lost control of this Congress in the summer of 1874, and from good and sufficient causes. I am not called upon to relate the causes here, but the political history of the country for the last twelve years will hold fast to the causes of that defeat.

The Democratic party came into power in 1875. It met with an irreparable loss during the first year of its accession to power. It lost a great leader, and the party in the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses worked out for itself, month by month, session by session, the result that finally overtook it in the last election.

Mr. HORR. Who is the dead Democrat?

Mr. DUNNELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been almost disposed to forgive the Democratic party for its career in the last four years of its control here.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio. Do not forgive it yet.

Mr. DUNNELL. Its career was doomed and marked out for it. The organization of this House in the Forty-fifth Congress foretold its doom. That Democratic House could no more revise the tariff than we can revise it. It was powerless to revise it, and it went on four years handicapped, bound hand and foot in its very organization; and a party thus committed in its organization, committed against reforms, against any progressive movement, cannot live. The people will not allow any party to remain in power many years that fails them in trial. The Democrats did not revise the tariff and could not. We are now putting ourselves into the same condition.

I have been frank, Mr. Chairman, in my statements, and have a right to be frank. I have the right of a representative of the people to say what I believe upon this floor, if not in violation of any of its rules. I may be entirely alone on this side of the House in my position on this tariff-commission bill. I may be wholly alone, and no man be in accord with me. The luxury of personal convictions is my privilege to enjoy. It is an immensely agreeable thing for a man to entertain his own convictions as I do on this question.

I said a little while ago that a party in this country that hopes to hold power a great while must be a progressive party. We cannot remain here, gentlemen, on this side of the House four, six, or eight years unless we do something. Our lost American commerce ought to be brought back; at least we ought to make some attempt to do it. We ought to revise this tariff. We ought to make something more for ourselves by way of record than we shall make unless we take hold of living issues.

The Democrats took up the cry of retrenchment and reform; the people grew weary of those words and desired practical legislation—legislation that effected them. A party assuming to control the interests of a mighty republic could not survive by making dollar reductions in petty offices. The people want to see a bold, progressive administration; full of pluck, of courage, and progressiveness. But if we turn over to experts work which we ought to do, and which the Constitution imposes upon us, we plead our own folly; we plead our own ignorance in the presence of the people; and we proclaim our departure from the course of action which the Constitution has marked out for us. [Applause.]

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's



desk to be read a resolution which, at the proper time after the discussion is closed, I propose to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill creating a tariff commission be recommitted, with instructions to the Committee on Ways and Means to report within thirty days, or an earlier date if it be practicable, a bill based upon the following instructions:

First. That all raw materials, meaning thereby all materials which have not been subjected to any process of manufacture, and all waste products, meaning thereby all waste materials which are fit only to be manufactured, and all chemicals which are not produced in this country, and alcohol for use in manufactures, shall be placed upon the free list.

Second. That so far as possible specific duties shall be substituted for ad valorem duties, and that in determining such specific duties the average dutiable value of imports during the last three years shall be taken as the standard of value, upon which no higher rate of duty shall be imposed than shall be necessary to compensate for the difference in the cost of the labor at home and abroad expended in the production of such products, after making due allowance for the expenses of transportation, and that the rate of duty shall not in any case, except on luxuries, exceed 50 per cent. of such average dutiable value.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Those gentlemen who have followed the distinguished Representative from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] in the remarks which he has just concluded, will find that in the resolution which has been read there is no issue to be made with him. But there is an issue which presents itself clearly and unmistakably with the doctrines which have been proclaimed on this floor by other gentlemen on his side of the House.

I confess that when the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] took the floor, I expected to have a little controversy with him as I find I have with the gentleman from Minnesota. I supposed that the gentleman from Iowa would plant himself upon the doctrine that American industry could not flourish without free raw materials. I supposed he would insist that protection, if ever granted, should be granted only to infant manufactures, and that in framing a tariff there should always be kept in view the desirable end of being able to get access to foreign markets with our surplus manufactured products.

I had reason for this expectation, for I remember that long before I became a member of this House, when I was deeply concerned in tariff legislation, in 1866 the gentleman from Iowa delivered upon this floor a speech which might almost be taken as the text for those who are now in favor of reforming the tariff and of getting to freer trade in the markets of the world. To my astonishment I found that he had abandoned the doctrines which he then proclaimed, that he has planted himself on the ground of protection for the sake of protection, and that he has enforced his position with facts, arguments, theories, and conclusions from which I am compelled absolutely to dissent. To these arguments and conclusions I propose to address myself to-day. I propose to show that wages are not and cannot be fixed and maintained by the tariff. I propose to show—

Mr. KASSON. Will the gentleman from New York before he passes on allow me to ask him if I understood him aright as saying I ever made a speech in 1866, or at any other time, advocating free trade?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I did not say the gentleman had made a speech advocating free trade.

Mr. KASSON. Did not the gentleman say—

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I will repeat what I said, and then the gentleman can correct me if he sees fit. I said that he, in 1866, proclaimed himself in favor of free raw material, and of protection only to infant industries; and for such a tariff as would enable us to get access to the foreign markets of the world in competition with other manufacturing nations.

Mr. KASSON. Then the gentleman will, with that modification, allow me to say—

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. No modification. I have repeated precisely what I said before.

Mr. KASSON. Then I challenge the production of any remark I ever made that ignored the question of protection where it was needed by American industry.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I do not know what the gentleman desires precisely. But I will ask the Clerk, as my own voice is unhappily in a very precarious condition, to read the passage I have marked from the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa made in the House on the 9th of July, 1866.

The Clerk read as follows:

What you call protection amounts, therefore, simply to a system of equal robbery; taking from one home interest to pay to another.

[Applause from the Democratic side.]

When you have done this you say that you have framed an equal tariff law, and that its equal protection is diffused over all the different interests. I say that this is illogical; it is absurd. You must change your theory of a tariff or else you must perpetually fail in your effort to gain a system that shall actually make the United States rich. If that is your object you must diminish the cost of the production of your manufactures; and when you have done that you have taken a great step toward protecting both the manufacturers and the people of the United States. But if we go on in the present plan of adding to the cost of everything we produce, there is not another country on the face of the globe that will contribute one cent to enrich the people of the United States or be able to buy a single article of our production.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. That, I think, makes a sufficient answer to the statement of the gentleman in regard to his position on protection. And I may add, further, that the very phrase "that it was robbery" was commented upon by General Garfield, who followed him in reply.

Mr. KASSON. If the gentleman will allow me, without taking time to read the context, I will refer him to page 3518 of the same

volume of debates, where I declared distinctly, in controversy with Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, that there were four classes of opinions upon the subject of protection and free trade. And I said:

Between these two extremes—

Prohibitory tariff and free trade—

are two classes. One of them wishes simply to foster the incipient industries of America until they are able to take care of themselves without help in fair competition with the industries of foreign countries. To that class of free-traders I belong.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. And I stated that the gentleman was in 1866 in favor of protection of infant manufactures. But those infants, after sixteen years, are now so much more feeble than they were then, that in his speech the other day he planted himself upon the doctrine of protection for the sake of protection.

Mr. KASSON. You will find that I stated then that my position was "to foster the incipient industries of America until they are able to take care of themselves without help in fair competition with the industries of foreign countries."

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. KASSON. Now, let me say further, in order to end this controversy, that I have never in any speech waived the right and duty of protecting American industries sufficiently for their maintenance. And whatever language the gentleman may quote of mine at that period, such as the language he has quoted now, was uttered in controversy about my position. I wish to say also that further examination and experience has convinced me more and more of the merits of my principle of protecting American industries always as long as needed to enable them to maintain themselves against the industries of foreign countries. And if I committed any folly several years ago I am not afraid to say now that it was a folly. But when the gentleman will fairly interpret the language he has quoted he will find it all standing upon that principle, it being a difference of opinion as to the extent to which protection should go.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I do not wish to deprive the gentleman of any opportunity to put himself right; but I am bound to say that if this comes out of my time I think it is rather unreasonable to ask it of me.

Mr. KASSON. It will not come out of the gentleman's time. I would like to ask the gentleman if in his opinion this statement is wrong?

An experience of more than ninety years has compelled me to believe that the protection of American labor demands from the American people their most profound consideration and their most decided action. The question now to be considered is, whether we, as a nation, are willing to know the truth and let the truth make and maintain our freedom, or whether we have deliberately determined to follow the advice of men and nations that have a direct and immediate interest in misleading and deceiving us.

I believe that to be so, and I am more than ever opposed to following the advice of the English nation, which my friend from New York is disposed to follow. What I have read is a statement by a man venerated throughout the country—not unknown to the gentleman from New York—whose name is Peter Cooper. [Great laughter.] I hope the gentleman will indorse that statement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I will reply to the gentleman in regard to Mr. Cooper as I did once on the occasion of a little dinner; and what I said then has never appeared in the papers. I said that usually when I was introduced to a stranger my introducer commonly said, "This is the son-in-law of Peter Cooper." I said that the greatest ambition of my life had been, at some time or other, that Mr. Cooper might be introduced to some one with the statement, "This is the father-in-law of Abram S. Hewitt." [Great laughter.]

Mr. KASSON. I believe that Mr. Cooper does not concur with the gentleman in that desire. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I have not that access to Mr. Cooper's opinions which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] seems to have. But I suggest to him that the speech which he made in 1866 shall be reprinted entire as an appendix to my speech. I did not intend to quote from it. I intended simply at the outset to say that I dissent from the gentleman's present position, but that I stand upon the doctrines of his speech of 1866. It might have been entirely unnecessary for me to do more than to republish that speech, in order to make the argument which I hope to make against this bill and in favor of an immediate revision of the tariff. With that I will ask the Clerk to read a passage which I have marked in the speech of the gentleman from Iowa at that time. It will be found on page 3718 of volume 59 of the Congressional Globe. It was made July 10, 1866.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KASSON. If I understand the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Woodbridge] correctly, in his opinion as well as mine the title of this bill should be changed so as to read, "A bill to prevent the diffused blessings of Divine Providence from being enjoyed by the people of the United States." It is an attempt against the laws of Providence to force the people of this country to pay more for what they need than the laws of Providence would otherwise require. As I was going on to say, this system of protecting one of the articles that you raise the cost of by this bill compels you to go immediately to another interest and raise the price of that. Take the article of wool, for instance; no sooner do you propose to increase the tariff on wool than you immediately go to the manufacturers of wool and give them an increased protection on their manufactures. And thus those who raise the wool pay back a large part of the bounty that is paid for the raising of wool to contribute to the bounty given to the manufacturer, and the non-producer of wool pays both bounties in buying his clothing. And so it is in relation to the article of iron, or upon any other particular branch upon which you increase your tariff, you immediately go off in another direction and increase the tariff upon other collateral interests affected by it; and so you build up a gigantic system of bounties

upon all these interests upon the plea of protecting them. The fundamental error in this bill is this: you endeavor to make the people of this country grow rich off each other.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KASSON. Do I understand that the gentleman from New York accepts my principle of protection?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Do I accept your principle of protection? I do not understand your principle of protection.

Mr. KASSON. Not as stated in what I read to the gentleman?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. What you read? I stand upon what the Clerk read and what you said.

Mr. KASSON. You take it away from all its context.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Well, I think I have had read now about one-quarter of that speech. I am ready to sit down and allow the whole speech to be read to this House in lieu of what I have to say.

Mr. KASSON. I do not think you could do better. [Laughter.] I think in a few years you will be quoting from the speech I made the day before yesterday.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I think the gentleman from Iowa will not complain that I have not allowed him the largest liberty to make his case clear. But if he desires I will print his entire speech as an appendix to mine, so that the country may have the opportunity to see whether he was right then or whether he is right now.

Mr. KASSON. You had better print yours as an appendix to mine.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. The gentleman from Iowa seems to be rather unhappy. I am sorry to be the cause of giving him unhappiness.

Mr. KASSON. Quite the contrary.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I accept the plea of infancy which the gentleman has put in here. I have had occasion to plead the "baby act" myself in the course of my time, and I know how it is myself.

Mr. KASSON. I am afraid you will have to do it again after this speech.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill creating a tariff commission, for the reason that it will make delay, and delay is dangerous in the present perilous condition of general business. We are now prosperous, but our prosperity will continue only so long as there is an adequate market for our products. At present we have a foreign market chiefly for raw materials—such as food products, cotton, petroleum, and tobacco. For our manufactured products the markets of the world are practically closed against us—closed because it is impossible to sell our goods in the open markets of the world in competition with other manufacturing nations. The reason of this is, mainly, that our tariff legislation has erected artificial barriers to the free introduction of raw materials, and by the imposition of unwise taxes we are handicapped at the very outset in the commercial race. These obstructions cannot be removed too soon. They are well known and can be enumerated without difficulty. We tax food, of which we are the great exporters; we tax wool, which is the foundation of a vast industry; we tax bituminous coal, iron ore, and scrap-iron which lie at the base of the great iron and steel industry; we tax copper ores, alcohol, and oils and numerous chemicals, without which many branches of industry cannot exist.

Having thus created an artificial system we find it impossible to compete with Great Britain and France and Germany, whose industry stands upon the firm and natural basis of free raw materials. This defect in our revenue system could be remedied by a joint resolution in one week, and the Committee on Ways and Means could then take as much time as might be needed to consider and adjust the infinite detail involved in the reconstruction of a tariff covering 2,500 articles. Unless a remedy be speedily applied the industry of this country will be surfeited by the excess of products for which it can find no market. There is a limit to the amount of food which we can sell abroad, and it is a great mistake to suppose that Europe cannot raise food in competition with America. The question is not, as many seem to suppose, so much the relative cost of production, as the amount of rent which can be collected from the farmer in Europe, in addition to the cost of production. It is therefore purely a question of rent. Foreign farms will not be abandoned, but the rents will be reduced and the products will be increased, so that, instead of larger, we are likely to have more restricted markets. The process of readjustment is now going on. Rents have been reduced from 20 to 30 per cent., and if that is not sufficient they will be further reduced until land is as free in Europe as it is upon this continent. Nations will not abandon the soil, but they will resist the imposition of rent and taxes which it will not bear.

To any one studying the condition of this country at the present time three things are evident: first, that we are the most prosperous people in the world; and there I agree with the gentleman from Iowa; secondly, that we are paying the highest wages of any people in the world; and there again I agree with the gentleman from Iowa; lastly, that we have the highest tariff duties of any nation in the world; and there I think I agree with the gentleman from Iowa. But he reasons *post hoc propter hoc*: because we have a high tariff, therefore we are prosperous, and therefore we pay the highest wages of any nation in the world.

But let me take him back to that era of depression between 1873 and 1879; and let us diagnose the condition of things then. We had then an era of depression in which men went to and fro in this land

begging for employment. Then we had the lowest rate of wages that has prevailed in this country for the last forty years; and then we had the same high tariff that we have to-day. If I were to reason, as the gentleman from Indiana did, *post hoc propter hoc*, I should say that the high tariff caused the bad times and the low wages and the want of work. But the truth is that the tariff has nothing to do with the matter. I will not say "nothing to do;" it has an influence for evil, but it has no influence for good; it cannot create good times; it cannot create high wages; it cannot give employment except in one single contingency, to which I shall recur hereafter; and in that contingency it was powerless from 1875 to 1878 inclusive.

The only logical conclusion from these facts which cannot be disputed is, that the depression then and the prosperity now, the low wages then and the high wages now, were not produced by the revenue system, in which no changes whatever have been made, but by causes which must be searched for elsewhere, and which must be understood before it will be possible for Congress to deal intelligently with the work of revenue reform, which public opinion requires it to undertake.

Now, then, I take my first proposition, directly antagonizing the gentleman from Iowa. I assert that *legislation cannot create value nor can it determine the rate of wages*. The issue is fairly made up. There is no source of wealth in any country except that which is derived from the soil by the application of labor, machinery, and capital.

It is not possible by any human contrivance, by any amount of abstract thought, by any schemes of legislation to add to the natural resources of any country. Whatever there may be, is in the soil and in the rain and sunshine that fructify it. Capital can only support the labor which is necessary to bring about the annual harvest, and machinery can only be used to economize the amount of labor bestowed. With labor and skill sufficient for the cultivation of the soil, the economy of production will be proportioned to the amount of capital and machinery employed in its cultivation. There is no royal road to wealth—there is no patent process by which the resources of nature can be augmented. "Can a man by taking thought add a cubit to his stature?" In the absence of any legislation the work of production will proceed in a natural channel, and all that legislation can by any possibility do will be to divert labor and capital from the direction which they would have taken under natural laws. I feel it necessary to make this statement, because many persons who have not given much reflection to this subject seem to think that there is some potency in legislation which can add value to the forces of nature. This fallacy underlies a great many of the propositions which are made in regard to money as well as industry. It is the key to the fiat-money delusion, and it is the explanation of the mistake which is made by those who advocate protection for the sake of protection. When it is once realized that value cannot be created by legislative action, and is the offspring only of hard and honest labor aided by actual capital—that is, by the possession of accumulated wealth either in the form of money, structures, materials, or machinery—most of the difficulties in the way of intelligent legislation and of placing our industry upon a secure basis will disappear.

But if legislation cannot create value, it can prevent the growth of wealth by misdirecting industry into unprofitable channels, and by depriving us of the profit which is realized when we exchange the products of our labor, properly applied, for commodities which can be produced in other countries with less expenditure of labor than is necessary to produce these commodities at home. In other words the profits of legitimate commerce may be altogether or partially destroyed by artificial obstructions to the free natural interchange of commodities. These obstructions constitute a deduction from the amount which our producers would otherwise receive for their labor and skill, and are therefore to be avoided, and not created by the action of government.

From this simple statement it will be apparent that I do not believe in the efficacy of taxation in any form as an aid to the development of industry. If we could dispense with taxation altogether it must be evident that the producers of this country would have more to spend and the consumers would get more for the money which they have to expend. As I have already stated, the only possible effect of taxes imposed upon foreign commodities must be to alter the direction or distribution of human effort. To understand the bearing of this proposition we must go back to the origin of the Government. In order to secure sufficient revenue, duties were placed upon imports, and those imports were selected upon which the duty could be most readily collected. The duty imposed added to the price of the article, and hence as this article was raised artificially in price, labor directed to its production would be better rewarded than labor devoted to the production of the untaxed article—assuming always that the labor and capital in each case were not misapplied. In such cases the revenue duty necessarily becomes protective, the labor devoted to the production of the protected article being thus better paid. Thus there is a diversion from the unprotected channels of business into the protected channels, until an equilibrium is produced between the wages paid in both divisions of production.

#### WAGES FIXED BY FREE TRADE AND NOT BY PROTECTION.

The exchanges made between these divisions very soon adjust themselves upon a common standard of wages, so that labor and capital are equally rewarded, whether employed in the protected or the unprotected branches of business. This proposition is true of a



country which has no surplus products to export, and in such a country the tax levied upon foreign imports distributes itself equally among the whole mass of the consumers. But whenever there is a great surplus of natural products to be exported the price of these products is not made at home, but in the foreign markets where they are sold, and the wages which can be paid to the laborer engaged in the production of these articles, are therefore and thenceforth fixed and determined by what they produce in money, not at home, but in the foreign markets where they are sold. When the time comes that these products constitute the great bulk of the industry of the country, then it is clear that the wages which can be paid for labor is fixed abroad, and not at home; in other words, by free trade and not by protection. This is our case at the present time. We are selling from seven to eight hundred millions of dollars' worth of our food and other raw products in Europe. These products represent the branch of business in which the largest number of our people are occupied, namely, in the agricultural employments, wherein nearly 50 per cent. of our people are employed.

Wages in this country are therefore not regulated by the tariff, because whatever wages can be earned by men engaged in the production of agricultural products, the price of which is fixed abroad, must be the rate of wages which will be paid substantially in every other branch of business. If other branches pay better, labor will quit agriculture and take to manufacture; and, *vice versa*, if agriculture pays better manufactures will decline and agriculture will progress. Wages, like water, seek a level. Thus we dispose of the first great fallacy of the protection system, which declares that a high tariff produces high wages. The wages of labor at any given time depend upon demand and supply. They will be high when our products are all wanted; they will be low when there is a surplus which the world will not take. Our great products are agriculture. In years of famine the world will take all we have to spare; in years of plenty there will be a surplus for which there is no foreign outlet. And in the absence of markets for our manufactured products, we are reduced to the unnatural position of basing our prosperity upon the misfortunes of mankind; when in fact the happiness and comfort of the human race ought to be proportioned to the abundance and not the scarcity of the necessities of life.

I have stated that the effect of import duties is to divert enterprise into the production of the articles upon which such duties are imposed, provided the natural conditions for their production are favorable. The development of the country accommodates itself to the situation thus created, and if circumstances or a mistaken policy lead to the imposition of other than revenue duties, then the articles so taxed will be produced in increasing quantities, until the market is supplied with the domestic product, and the foreign article is altogether excluded. A tax thus imposed for revenue at the outset, if sufficiently high, first becomes protective, and then becomes prohibitory in the natural course of events, and the whole industrial structure of the country accommodates itself to this condition of affairs. Interests of a vast and complicated nature are created, intertwining and interlacing with each other, so that any injury to one immediately reacts upon all the others.

If by any possibility, as did occur in our case, the exigencies of war require the imposition of taxation on every conceivable form of value, and upon an unprecedented scale, then the interests created are so powerful, and reach into so many remote connections, that the work of reduction becomes not only exceedingly difficult, but very dangerous to the immediate welfare of society. The long era of depression to which I have adverted was, in my judgment, caused by the great waste of capital due to the war and to the false system of finance under which we carried on the struggle. High duties were absolutely essential to meet the interest upon the public debt thus created, and when the reaction came, it was impossible to reduce these duties without interfering disastrously with many branches of business, which were notwithstanding these high duties at times carried on at a loss.

#### LACK OF EMPLOYMENT.

The greatest calamity that can befall a nation is that any considerable portion of its laboring population should be unable to get work. That was the condition between 1873 and 1879. Any considerable reduction of duties at that time must have added to the army of unemployed laborers. In bad times tariff reform is not possible; because of the suffering which is produced in special cases at a time when the demand for labor is slack. It is only in good times that we can attack the problem and hope to introduce reforms. But even then these reforms must be so made as not to cripple or interfere with any considerable existing interest. The object must be not to cripple but rather to remove obstructions which interfere with the natural and healthy growth of business.

We must therefore proceed slowly so as not to interfere with the occupations of people, and not to dislocate industry to such an extent that men are compelled to seek new occupations by a sudden stoppage of those in which they are engaged. This has happened in Germany, where the new revenue system of a highly protective nature has positively destroyed many branches of business and reduced whole towns to a condition of destitution. In lowering the duties I would be careful to avoid these calamitous consequences, for, as I have said, there is no evil in a community equal to the lack of employment for those who desire work. Persons out of work not only become demoralized but they compete with others who are employed, reducing the

standard of comfort and lowering the moral status of the entire community. They are not only paupers themselves but they breed pauperism—a social disease so persistent when once permitted to get a foothold that no amount of moral quarantine is ever adequate to remove it.

But, on the other hand, if reforms are not introduced we come upon another condition of affairs which is even worse than the one which we have described and desire to avoid. That condition of affairs springs from what is mistaken overproduction—that is, from the production of articles which the world wants but from whose markets we are excluded by an unnatural revenue system, shutting us up as if we were bounded by an impassable stone wall. This is the condition in which we shall find ourselves whenever by good harvests abroad we shall no longer have a foreign market for the surplus products of our farms and our plantations. In the ordinary course of nature this condition cannot be far distant, and it is for that reason that I fear the delay which will be inevitable if action upon the tariff is to be postponed until we get the report of any commission, no matter how constituted.

#### COMMISSIONS.

Although the French commissions of inquiry on the tariff simply delayed legislation for five years, and then bore no valuable fruits, against commissions I have no prejudice. In the English system of jurisprudence they do most excellent work, and they can be introduced with great advantage into many branches of our own administration, where we are suffering from the lack of a comprehensive knowledge of the facts necessary to secure reform. When the Eaton bill was introduced two years ago, I was willing to accept it, because we were then at the outset of an era of prosperity, which I felt sure would last long enough for the commission to report, and for legislative action to be taken. But now the time for a commission has passed by. The country cannot afford to wait for the results of its investigations. The business of the country is still prosperous, but the conditions on which its prosperity rests have greatly changed since the Eaton bill was passed by the Senate in the Forty-sixth Congress. Then we had begun to enjoy the fruits of a concurrence of favorable conditions such as have never existed before in the history of this or any other country.

#### CAUSES OF PROSPERITY.

For six years, between 1873 and 1879, the country had been economizing its resources and paying its debts. It was a period of the strictest economy, public and private, and of the accumulation of capital in the shape of convertible assets. The transfer of floating into fixed capital had practically ceased, and is sufficient to account for the want of an adequate demand for labor in the ordinary channels of business. It was a period of incubation and of recuperation. The resources of the country had been overstrained and exhausted by the expenditures of the war, and by the delirium of an incontrovertible paper currency, which produced an unnatural exhilaration in the industrial system. The reaction was necessarily severe. It did not and could not cease until the currency was placed on the solid basis of convertibility into gold, the universal standard of value in the world of commerce. This restoration of the currency of itself set free as money, and added to its available stock, all the accumulation of the precious metals in the Treasury, which before had been as dormant as if they were still locked up in the mines whence they had been extracted. It is the rapid circulation of money and its availability for immediate use, rather than its mere existence which produce activity in business and inspire a healthy trade. The freeing of \$250,000,000 of coin, before denied an outlet into the channels of commerce would alone have been sufficient to restore confidence and give new life to the energies of the people.

But contemporaneous with the resumption of specie payments, and preceding it for a sufficient time to make resumption possible, came the period of famine in Europe and of abundance in the United States, whereby the balance of trade, so long adverse, was turned in our favor, and from being a debtor nation we were enabled to pay off all our floating obligations, largely to reduce our permanent debt to foreigners, and to draw from Europe a vast sum in actual specie: in 1879, \$12,853,594; in 1880, \$85,239,284; in 1881, \$105,393,594; making a total of \$203,481,472 up to the month of January, 1882, when the tide turned, and the outward current has set in. Besides this great addition to our reserves of specie we were able to retain the entire production of our gold and silver mines, amounting in the same period to over \$200,000,000, making a total addition in three years to the bullion and coin reserves of the country of over \$400,000,000, a sum which dwarfs the treasures of "Ormus or of Ind," recalling the tide of wealth which after the discovery of America served, through Spanish channels, to revolutionize the whole face of European commerce.

Besides such causes as these, with the effect of which economists were familiar and could predict, there was another element in regard to which no previous experience existed, and which added to the net profits of our foreign trade an amount which has not been estimated, and which but few persons appreciate. I refer to the cheapening of transportation caused by the substitution of steel for iron rails, and the general introduction of screw propellers and compound engines into ocean steamers. The economy of these improvements has inured to the benefit of the United States chiefly, and the reduction in cost has been added to the profits of the producers upon this side of the ocean, while it has not been of corresponding advantage to the coun-

tries who compete with us for supplying the manufacturing nations of Europe with food.

The current price of grain, like that of other products, depends upon the demand and supply from day to day and from week to week, but the underlying and pre-existing conditions of production determine the average price at which grain may be permanently and regularly supplied. In Great Britain, which affords the great market for our food products, the cost of production is increased by a system of rents which must be added to the natural cost of production. Our great competitors for supplying the English markets with grain are yet without any considerable railroad system, lacks the best tools of production, such as plows, reapers, and thrashing-machines, and have no elevators for handling grain at the ports of shipment.

Such were in brief the conditions of competition when our railroad system, steadily growing and expanding, reached the greatest and most fertile portions of the wheat-growing regions of the valleys of the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Saskatchewan Rivers and their tributaries. The introduction of steel rails, the cost of producing which had, by invention and experience, been reduced to an equality with iron rails, so rapidly brought down the expense of transportation, that within ten years the charges of carrying grain have been reduced from 1.59 cents to .3945 cents per ton per mile during the recent railroad war. In the same manner the cost of ocean freights has been reduced from 10.56 pence in 1873 to 4.13 pence in 1881 for a bushel estimated to weigh 60 pounds. The whole of this reduction in the cost of transportation from the farms of the West to the grain markets of Europe has gone into the pockets of the producers and has been added to the wealth of the United States, and this has happened because the unusual scarcity of food in Europe has afforded an adequate market for our entire surplus. I estimate that the sum thus added to our national wealth in three years amounts to a sum larger, including the saving on domestic consumption, than the whole value of the food products which we have exported to foreign countries.

To Sir Henry Bessemer chiefly, and to our lately deceased countryman, Alexander Lyman Holley, who perfected Bessemer's invention, do we owe these vast results, which are rapidly changing the face of society, undermining the strongholds of privilege and monopoly, and will ultimately transfer the primacy of industry from the European to the American continent, unless we obstruct the course of nature by artificial impediments and unwise legislation.

The result of this great invention is already to be seen and felt in the land movement in Ireland, Scotland, and England, certain to end in the downfall of the aristocratic system, and the transfer of the land on equitable conditions to the actual cultivators of the soil. When this is accomplished the margin of profit now realized from supplying Europe with food will be reduced, and for this curtailment of profit we must prepare by making the conditions and cost of production more favorable than they are now. In other words, every obstruction to the cheap production of food from unnecessary taxes, either national or municipal, must be removed, and every possible element of economy must be introduced. But the pressure from this direction is not yet felt, and will not be felt until abundant harvests in Europe shall reduce the average price of grain.

Now, the result of the cessation of the era of depression, stagnation, rest, and recuperation which followed the panic of 1873, and of the revival of business due to the substitution of good money for bad money—of the fortunate concurrence of unlimited markets for our food products, with the cheapening of transportation due to the application of new and most beneficent inventions, of which we are able to appropriate the first and best fruits, has been to reopen the channels of immigration which had been closed for five long and weary years, thus restoring an element of growth and prosperity which had been absent for a time. The number of immigrants who came to our shores in 1879 was 250,565; in 1880, 593,703; in 1881, 720,045, making a total in three years of nearly 1,600,000 persons—exceeding the combined population of Maine, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island—and if it should continue as it is now proceeding in three years more the number of immigrants for six years will exceed the entire population of New England.

In the main this addition of our population consists of a hardy, frugal, and industrious class, who go direct to the land and aid in producing the products which we sell abroad. They have thus enabled us practically to reap the vast profit which has made the revival of business in this country a possibility and a reality. They have brought us not only bone and sinew and muscle but in actual money an amount which in the year 1881 is estimated to have exceeded sixty millions of dollars; and if ever a human being in the prime of life had a market value of \$1,000, then the productive power of this nation was increased over \$700,000,000 by the emigrants who reached our shores in a single year.

I have not time to pursue further the estimate and statement of the inconceivable advance made by the United States during the last ten years in all the elements of wealth, and in the fundamental conditions which produce prosperity and business. The increase in population alone amounts to 30 per cent., but this increase gives but little idea of the growth of wealth during the decade which has just closed. When the census figures are available it will be found that we have made vast strides in the accumulation of capital, in the capacity for production, and in the development of the fundamental conditions upon which we may hope to enter into the great markets of the world

with the products of our genius and industry applied to the forces of nature.

It is estimated by the best authorities that the wealth of the world increases, at the present time, at the rate of \$10,000,000 per day, to which the United States contributes from one-quarter to about one-third, and therefore grows richer at the rate of \$2,500,000 with each revolution of the sun; but this increase, amounting to \$1,000,000,000 annually, depends upon our having full employment for our labor in channels where it is usefully bestowed.

#### HOW TO INSURE PROSPERITY.

I have entered into this exhaustive, and possibly exhaustive analysis of the causes which have produced the improved and satisfactory condition of business, in order to demonstrate my second proposition, which is, *that the existing tariff has been as powerless to produce the prosperity we now enjoy as it was to prevent the depression of business from which, happily, we emerged in 1879, which it then served to aggravate by denying us access to foreign markets for our manufactured products.* In spite of the tariff, and not because of it, we alone of all the nations of the world can be said to be in a prosperous condition. To insure the continuance of this prosperity is the first and highest duty of statesmanship. If it can be made permanent by sitting still, by refraining from legislation, then Congress should not meddle with our revenue system, no matter what may be our preconceived notions on vexed economic questions, whether we be the devotees of free trade or the advocates of protection. When things are well and likely to continue well *quieta non movere* is the safest rule of statesmanship. But if we can detect the clouds which precede the storm in the industrial world, then it is our duty to provide against the coming dangers and to avert, as far as we can, its disastrous consequences from the firesides of those who have sent us here to protect the present and provide for the future welfare of the people.

If it were done, when 'tis done, then 'twere well  
It were done quickly.

Let us then see how far the causes of our present prosperity are continuing causes—how far they are permanent, and how far they are transitory. In considering this question let me say that the great natural resources upon which the prosperity of the country is founded cannot in our day be exhausted or sensibly impaired. We have in fact but explored the outcrop of the treasures with which our common country is endowed. There will be a population of 200,000,000 before there can be any pressure for room, or upon the means of subsistence, provided perfect freedom for development and for the interchange of commodities is secured and access for our products is not denied to the open markets of the world.

We may also assume that the free Government under which we have grown with such marvelous strides and which is so admirably adapted to full continental development will be preserved by the people, who comprehend that civil liberty is the corner-stone upon which individual enterprise and personal prosperity are founded.

We may conclude that the benefits of a sound currency are now so fully understood that nothing short of the exigencies of a great civil conflict, apparently and happily now impossible, will ever be permitted to disturb or banish the metallic money of the Constitution and of the fathers. But we shall not again experience the stimulus which was given to confidence and enterprise by the resumption of specie payments. That work is done, and, as I hope, with the coming decision of the Supreme Court in regard to legal-tender issues, will never have to be encountered again. The benefit of a sound currency will be a continuing one, but the stimulus of its recovery is exhausted and cannot be renewed.

So in like manner we shall never again, in all human probability, feel the sudden and incalculable benefit of a great reduction in the cost of transportation. It is inconceivable that another Bessemer invention can in our day be made and perfected. If ever there is to be another benefaction in this direction, it must come from the superseding of railroads by some other or better mode of transportation, in the air or in the water, or by some improvement in motive power through the gate which has of late been opened by the progress of electrical science. But so far as human judgment can predict the cost of railroad transportation reached its minimum during the recent war of the trunk lines.

What cause then remains to insure to us a continuance of our prosperity? Only the access which we have to the foreign markets of the world for our raw products. What are the facts in regard to these markets, and the prospect of their continuing to absorb not only the quantity heretofore taken but the increasing surplus which we get from the steadily increasing acreage brought into cultivation. For three years past we have been relieved from the necessity of asking or considering this question, but to-day it presses upon us for solution. Already the change has commenced. The official returns from the year 1881 are now available, and cast an electric light upon the dangers of our present condition. The change is positively startling and must arrest the attention of every thoughtful student of public affairs.

#### THE SITUATION.

The exports of 1880 were \$875,564,075; the exports of 1881 were \$814,161,573, showing a decrease of \$61,402,502. This decrease of itself would be most suggestive of serious changes in our commercial position, but when it is found that the whole of this enormous



decrease has taken place during the last four months of the year and is therefore going on at the rate of \$180,000,000 per annum, we cannot shut our eyes to the peril of the situation.

While the exports have thus decreased the imports have increased in the last five months of the year \$32,000,000, or at the rate of nearly \$80,000,000 per annum. If the same proportions should continue during the year 1882—and so far as the month of January is concerned it has continued—the change will amount to over \$250,000,000 in our international balance-sheet. The balance in our favor in the fiscal year 1881, amounting to the enormous sum of \$259,712,718, would thus be totally extinguished, and we should be compelled to disgorge the treasures of gold and silver, of stocks and bonds, which we have accumulated during the past three years of plenty with us and famine with our customers.

What will be the actual result I do not pretend to predict, but the shipments of gold have already commenced, the stock exchanges of the country are deeply disturbed, and values have seriously fallen; mercantile failures are increasing and confidence is impaired, so that a halt has already been called upon enterprises of a speculative character, while others, based upon sound principles, are compelled to move with great caution. The situation, if not alarming, is very serious. If there is not likely to be a sufficient outlet abroad for our surplus products they must be consumed at home or perish in storehouses and granaries. We can all recollect such periods in our history and know what depression, distress, and general disaster such a surplus of products not needed for consumption is sure to entail; our very abundance becomes the source of our misery.

This brings me to my third proposition, which is, *that access to the open markets of the world for our manufactured products is essential to the continuance of our prosperity.*

#### STEPS TO BE TAKEN.

If we could consume our surplus food in the production of manufactured articles which could find an outlet in the open markets of the world, which we could sell in competition with other nations, who are not impeded by charges upon raw materials, we could at least, if no longer able to draw into our coffers the accumulations of gold and silver with which our industry has been fructified—we could at least find occupation for our working population, and gradually establish our industries upon so broad a basis that the failure or superabundance of a single harvest would not affect their general stability. It is true that we cannot hope to provide remedial measures which will produce immediate results, but any improvement in the conditions for production by which our markets may be widened will moderate the impending calamity and shorten its duration. Any delay in removing these obstructions is not only dangerous but positively criminal. Congress will be held to a strict account for its sins of omission as well as of commission. So far as we have the knowledge and experience, we are bound to apply it at once to the problem which is upon us and demands solution. If there be things which require investigation before action, let them by all means be investigated; but while we are waiting for the results of this investigation neither public opinion nor our own conscience will justify us in postponing the consideration of the reforms for which the knowledge exists, the facts are accumulated, and the need is urgent.

What steps can then be taken in order to relieve the force of the calamity which will result from being cut off from the abundant markets which we have had for our surplus products during the last three years?

Happily in considering the situation we are relieved from all the necessity of deciding the vexed question of free trade or protection. That question, important as it is, is not now involved in the work before us. I have already pointed out that interests have grown up under the existing tariff, which has lasted for twenty years, of such a vast and complicated nature, and employing such a large proportion of our population that any interference which would tend to dislocate this industry, that would be likely to impair its efficiency and not advance the substantial elements of its prosperity, growth, and increase, would not only be an act of folly but would produce results so disastrous to the whole community that no party or set of men who might undertake it would be sustained by the popular approval, but would be consigned to oblivion at least for a generation. I have already pointed out the direction in which the reforms may be undertaken, and the obstructions to the development and growth of our industry interposed by the tariff may be removed, not only without injury to any existing interest, but to its positive benefit.

#### BENEFCIENT EFFECT OF REDUCING TAXATION.

The existing tariff was enacted as a war measure, intended to raise revenue at any cost. It succeeded in its purpose. To-day it produces \$150,000,000 annually more than is needed for the national expenditure. To that extent it imposes an unnecessary burden upon the productive energies of the people. It is a tax upon consumption and is substantially a per capita tax, and therefore presses with peculiar severity upon the working classes. If this surplus tax were not collected there would be just so much more left in the pockets of those who pay it. Stated in its simplest form, it is an unnecessary tax of \$3 per head upon each inhabitant of the country. Assuming that each workman supports five persons, including himself, he is paying an unnecessary tax of \$15 a year. If this tax were removed he would either have \$15 more in cash to expend, which would in-

crease the general volume of business and the demand for labor, or he could afford, in case of close competition, to take \$15 less wages, which would cheapen the cost of new products and enable new markets to be secured. Obviously, then, it is the immediate duty of Congress to remove this excessive tax, in order that either the remuneration of labor may be enhanced, or the market for it enlarged, at the time when it is threatened with restricted markets abroad for its products, and restricted employment at home. Nor can this duty be postponed or delayed without aggravating the distress which must inevitably fall upon the working classes, when the demand for labor is narrowed by any cause whatever. And here let me say that Congress, in giving attention to what the best interests of the workmen of the country demand, will best serve the interests of capital which, so long as it has the protection of law common to all property, needs no special protection, and least of all protection at the expense of the normal remuneration of labor.

In reforming the tariff I would select first the raw materials of industry and waste products as proper subjects to be transferred to the free list. This change will lead at once to the extension of many branches of business and the establishment of many new avenues for labor. No injury will be done to any existing interest, because on these raw products the freight is always sufficient to compensate for the difference of the rate of wages prevailing in this country, and in the countries from which these products are imported. Many of these raw materials are needed for mixing with our own materials, and indeed many branches of industry cannot be successfully conducted without such admixture. Every pound of foreign material thus imported will enable an additional quantity of our own materials to be used, and in this way the market for these materials and the area for the employment of labor will be greatly and steadily enlarged. The abolition of the duty on raw materials will then enable us to make a corresponding reduction in the duties imposed on the manufactured products of which they are a component part. This reduction of duty on the manufactured product will lead to lower prices, which in their turn will produce a larger consumption, whereby the area of employment will again be enlarged. Notably in this class of reduction will be placed the manufactures of cotton, wool, iron, steel, and many chemical products. This will relieve us from the necessity for raising duties in any case, as was proposed in what is known as the McKinley bill. In the rearrangement of the tariff upon this basis, I shall be able to produce the testimony of the most intelligent manufacturers engaged in these great branches of industry, that the result will be beneficial and not injurious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move the time of the gentleman from New York be extended indefinitely.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is ordered accordingly.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Ohio and of the House for their courtesy.

#### PROTECTIVE DUTIES.

The argument for protective duties is based entirely upon the difference which exists between the compensation for labor paid in this country and in the countries with which we compete. I have already shown that this difference is not due to protective duties and cannot be affected by them, but arises from the great natural advantages which the labor of this country enjoys and from the absence of vast standing armies, which elsewhere consume the substance of the people. But the difference in wages does exist, and there are branches of industry which cannot be carried on without an equivalent compensation in the form of protective duties, or of a bounty from the public treasury. Whether it would have been better originally that these branches of industry should never have received any artificial stimulus, is a question which it is not necessary now to discuss. They do exist as the result of a revenue system, which is the growth of a hundred years, and I do not think that there is anywhere the wish, if there be anywhere the power, to strike these industries down. I acknowledge, therefore, and I assert, that at this late day it is not possible, nor politic, to reorganize our general business upon any other basis, than that which recognizes, and so long as possible perpetuates, the difference which exists in the rate of wages, because even if the purchasing power of our wages were no greater than those which are paid by our competitor, we make a very great gain when we exchange products produced at a high rate of wages with nations where a lower rate of wages prevails. If we sell our labor abroad at \$1 per day and purchase the products of foreign labor equally efficient at fifty cents per day, we get the fruits of two days' labor in exchange for one. Hence, it is our interest not to cut off and restrict foreign trade, but to give it the largest expansion which is possible without reducing the rate of wages paid in this country.

It is thus that foreign commerce is profitable; not by the interposition of obstructive charges, as my colleague from New York [Mr. Hirscock] seemed to suppose in his recent remarks, but by the removal of all impediments in the way of the interchange of commodities which are produced with less labor in our country than in the other with which it exchanges.

As long, then, as the higher rate of wages may be maintained in this country, and as long as we desire to preserve those branches of business wherein the higher rate makes it impossible for us to compete on even terms with other nations, we must so arrange the tariff

that in these branches, there is a rate of duty established which will compensate for the difference of the cost of labor in each. In order to do this we must determine, first, what is the actual difference in the rate of wages, and, secondly, how the duty shall be applied in each case in order to compensate for this difference.

I shall not have time to go into details as to the difference in the rate of wages, but I will append to these remarks the tables which were constructed in the State Department in 1879, giving the different rates of wages and the cost of food in the different countries of the world in the year 1878, when wages were lowest not only in this country but in all countries. It will be sufficient for me now to say, that as between Great Britain and the United States, the rate of wages is on the average about 50 per cent. higher here than there. It is true that skilled labor is much more highly paid in the United States than in Great Britain, while the difference in common labor is not so great as I have stated; but the tendency of modern industry is to introduce machinery by which the amount of skilled labor employed is steadily reduced. This is strikingly illustrated in the manufacture of Bessemer steel, where, although the profits have been upon a scale of unprecedented magnitude, the wages paid for common labor in Pennsylvania (\$1.17 per head) is precisely the same as the wages paid for the same class of labor in iron works, while the wages for skilled labor in the Bessemer steel works are very much less than the wages paid for skilled labor in iron works, being \$2.46 per day in the former and \$3.03 per day in the latter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that on account of skill?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. No; because by the machinery of the Bessemer steel works another set of faculties in the human constitution is called into exercise. It is rather in the eye you want skill there than in the manipulation, while in the iron works it is rather the skilled hand than the skilled eye.

#### INDUSTRIES DEPENDENT ON PROTECTION.

The branches of business which are dependent upon the tariff are chiefly the manufactures of cotton, wool, flax, iron and steel, pottery, and silk. They employ a large number of operatives, although by no means so large a ratio of the population as is generally supposed, probably not exceeding  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. If the works engaged in these manufactures were stopped, the persons employed would doubtless be absorbed in other branches of business without affecting materially the wages of labor. We have in fact absorbed in the last three years a foreign immigration far larger than all the population depending upon the manufacture of iron and steel, and we have done this not only without reducing the wages of labor but in the face of an actual rise in wages. Nevertheless during the process of absorption very great suffering would be entailed upon the workmen who would be thus compelled to seek new occupations. Their present business has been assigned to them not of their own choice but by the operation of laws which did not make, but which were made very largely in order to save the life of the nation in its hour of peril. In dealing with these interests, therefore, we have every motive to be considerate and just, and in effecting reforms which we believe to be necessary, because they are inevitable, we must take care not to narrow or close up the immediate avenues of employment for any class, which depends upon the industries requiring protective duties for their continued existence. In determining the rate of duty which each one of these branches requires, it will be necessary to ascertain the ratio which the labor employed in each bears to the market value of the products when produced. The ratio is not always the same in different industries between the cost of the labor and the cost of the raw material. From the examinations which I have made, the results of which only it is here possible to give, I am satisfied that in the cotton manufactures duties varying between 25 and 30 per cent. will be sufficient, in the woolen business from 30 to 35 per cent., in the iron and steel business from 35 to 50 per cent., in the pottery business about the same rates, and in the silk business about 40 per cent. would cover the difference in labor, provided the duties are entirely removed from the raw materials used in these several branches of manufacture. Now, if it be conceded, or can be demonstrated, that these rates are sufficient in order to compensate for the difference in the wages of labor, we have simply to apply them in order to meet the demands of those who insist and concede that the tariff must afford adequate protection to American labor.

#### TARIFF FOR REVENUE ADEQUATE FOR PROTECTION.

While I myself believe with General Garfield, that "revenue is the primary object of a tariff," and protection only the necessary incident, and otherwise neither lawful nor desirable, I find there is in reality a substantial harmony of interests in framing a tariff, whether designed for revenue or protection, looking to the interests of the whole community, in which the consumer is entitled to protection equally with the producer. It is idle to adopt a rate of duty which produces no revenue, therefore in devising a revenue tariff the rate to be adopted should be that which produces the amount of revenue required on the average of years. In the very nature of the case the results of such a duty must be fluctuating, at times admitting of large importations and at other times absolutely preventing importations. Now, the only time when the competition of foreign products is to be dreaded is when prices are low and foreign nations seek to flood our market with their surplus products. At such times, it is the part of wisdom to preserve our home market for our own industry if possible. Employment is then slack, and any considerable introduction of foreign

goods tends to diminish the demand for home labor, and I have already pointed out the evils which result when any considerable part of the population seeks work in vain.

Now, the amount of duty which is required to preserve our home market under such circumstances becomes a revenue rate of duty when prices begin to rise and importations are resumed. While protecting the American producer in his hour of need, it then protects the American consumer by keeping the prices in check and giving him a chance of supplying his wants abroad, in case he cannot get what he wants at a fair price at home. In other words, the revenue duty properly applied, protects the producer when he needs protection and protects the consumer when he needs protection, while, so far as the Treasury is concerned, it receives on the average of years a reasonable and adequate contribution from the trade of the country.

Thus it is apparent that "a tariff with incidental protection" and "a tariff for revenue only" are in effect identical and are convertible phrases. This proposition is, however, only true of specific and not of ad valorem duties. If the duty rises with the price, the consumer is cut off from the protection of fair competition, while the producer gets the benefit of a high duty when he does not need it, and finds the duty fall to an unprotecting point when he does need it. If, therefore, the normal rate of duty be 35 per cent., or whatever it may be, it should be applied to the average price of the commodity, and the specific amount thus arrived at should be the rate of duty adopted in any proposed tariff.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio. What does the gentleman mean by needed protection of industries?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. They would receive all necessary protection.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him what he means by necessary protection, as he claims that no protection is necessary?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. If the gentleman will recall what I have already said he will see that I enumerated several branches of business in this country which could not exist in competition with foreign countries unless the difference in the rate of wages was compensated by countervailing duties, and that is what I mean by needed protection.

#### MONOPOLIES TO BE AVOIDED.

I have thus established my fourth proposition, which is, *that a tariff designed to produce an adequate revenue on the average of years will give all the protection which American industry needs*; and in fact I think I have shown that the true revenue duty coincides with, and affords the protection which, on any reasonable theory of equivalents, can be demanded for American industry, and I have given a rule easy to be applied for formulating the rates required for this purpose. Any other method of procedure has, and would have, only the effect to build up special interests at the expense of the general good, and to produce anomalies which are at war not only with the fundamental principles of economic science but with the welfare of the community. The manufacture of steel rails affords an example of this violation of sound principle. The duty which was once a reasonable application of the ad valorem principle has become in the course of time, by the progress of invention and experience, oppressive and prohibitory, and has produced some results so remarkable that they should be recorded as a warning.

Last year the production of steel rails in this country was in round numbers a million of tons. Inasmuch as the demand exceeded the supply the whole or nearly the whole duty (\$28 per ton) was added to the price. I think I am justified in saying from my knowledge of the business, that the profits of last year were between fifteen and twenty millions of dollars on an original investment of not more than the same amount. Now, if this vast profit had been divided between the owners of the works and the labor employed in operating them, the community at large, although still paying an extravagant price for the steel rails which they require, might perhaps look with some complacency upon the exactions to which they have been subjected by the operation of the law; but the inexorable rule, that wages are determined by demand and supply, applies itself to the manufacture of steel rails with the same certainty that it operates in other branches of business.

According to the census returns the workmen employed in the Bessemer steel works in 1880 were 10,835 in number, and were paid \$4,930,340, being at the rate of \$460 per head, while in the iron works 80,133 workmen received \$34,047,099, being at the rate of about \$450 per head. As a matter of fact, I presume they were paid at exactly the same rate on the average. But there was this remarkable difference between the two branches of business: in the steel works \$5,000,000 paid out in wages produced a profit of from fifteen to twenty millions of dollars to the proprietors, while in the iron works \$5,000,000 paid out in wages did not produce more than \$1,000,000 profit to the owners. At least in my own experience the profits in the manufacture of iron do not exceed on the average of years 20 per cent. of the amount paid out in wages, and 1880 was an average and not an exceptional year. The operation of the tariff therefore, so far as steel rails are concerned, is not to benefit the working classes, who are not paid at any higher rate than they would be paid in any other branch of business, but to take from the community at large at least fifteen times, if not twenty times, as much profit as the general average business of the country will warrant. It is thus that the rich grow



richer and the poor poorer, and it is facts such as these that call upon us in solemn tones and without delay to remove from the statute-book all legislation which tends to aggravate the inequalities of fortune.

COMMISSION UNNECESSARY.

The principles I have laid down can be applied without the aid of any commission. As I have already said, the information is already in the possession of the Committee on Ways and Means, or within the knowledge of members of this House. If the committee is disinclined to undertake the task of applying these principles, then let the Representatives in Congress assembled undertake it and constitute special committees for the work. There is no leading branch of business which is not represented in this House. Members here know what measures of reduction can be permitted and what raw materials can be admitted free. To this work of reform both parties are committed. President Arthur in his letter of acceptance used the following language:

Such changes should be made in the present tariff system of taxation as will relieve every burdened industry and enable our artisans and manufacturers to compete successfully with those of other lands.

On the other hand the Democrats, when they planted themselves upon a tariff for revenue only, declared through their leading men, and by ever authority whose utterances are worth considering, that their only intention was to remove the obstructions to the growth of industry by making raw materials free and by establishing a rate of duty which would be just as between the producer and the consumer, protecting each at the time when each needed protection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the gentleman in favor of the abolition of the duty on wool?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I am absolutely in favor of the abolition of the duty on wool, and I am confirmed in this view by the opinion of the largest wool manufacturer in the United States. If the wool-growers have removed from them the burdens of the extra price they pay on everything they consume they will receive ample indemnity for any sacrifice they may make in the reduction of the duty on wool.

CONSEQUENCES OF DELAY.

My fifth proposition is, that if we shall fail to deal with this question now and at once, it is inevitable that we shall soon be relegated to the condition of suffering in which we found ourselves during the trying era between 1873 and 1879. During that period of suffering we had all the benefit which a protective tariff can offer, for the tariff we have now was the tariff we had then, and yet business was never so bad, employment never so hard to get, and wages were never at a lower ebb. This fact is sufficient demonstration that the tariff does not and cannot control the rate of wages, or provide an avenue for labor, except in the one contingency when foreigners seek to make a market for their surplus products in a period of general stagnation, and for this contingency a tariff designed for revenue on the average of years, as I have already shown, fully provides. What troubled us in that sad time of depression was the fact that, weighted as we were with duties upon the materials which lie at the basis of industry, we could not get access to the general markets of the world for our products. When such a period returns, as return it will, we shall encounter precisely the same difficulty, but it will be aggravated beyond any past experience by the great increase in the capacity for production which we have been making during the last four years.

Mr. KELLEY. Could England find a market for her products during the era to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. It could not.

Mr. KELLEY. Then it was not protective duties which shut our commodities out of other markets? But was it not the inability of the people to consume? And further, did that not come from a financial cause, namely, the suppression by Germany of the great part of her paper—of bank notes under \$25, or £5 sterling, the abrogation of the use of silver by Germany, the steady application of our surplus revenue to the contraction of our "greenbacks"? I am not going into a discussion of which is money, but to assert that greenbacks performed the functions of money.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. But I am afraid the gentleman is.

Mr. KELLEY. They were then performing the service of money, but the demonetization of silver by this Government through the withdrawal of the medium of exchange from the world by these two governments, did it not paralyze industry, the consumptive capacity of the whole world? No tariff can control such contingencies. [Applause.]

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I will answer the gentleman by saying that his long question is a conundrum proper to be addressed to the Republican party. They framed all this legislation.

Mr. KELLEY. Oh, no; they did not frame the German legislation.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I did not interrupt the gentleman, but let him have his own time. They framed all the financial legislation of this country. They created this system of taxation which I think one of the worst ever constructed, and which contributed more than anything else to bring on the financial depression to which he refers. When we got back to the solid Democratic ground of hard money then we got back to prosperity. I answer the gentleman, therefore, in this wise: if he is, like Martha of old, troubled about the many things he has pointed out to me, I ask that he go over to

his own side and settle it with his own people. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. I should like the gentleman to answer whether I did not name the causes.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. You named a great many causes, but I find the gentleman generally omits the right cause, which is in this case a high prohibitory and destructive and obstructive tariff. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. I refer to that period, and ask the gentleman whether I attribute to the right causes, to the coincident demonetization of silver by the United States?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I have heard the whole catalogue.

Mr. KELLEY. To the contraction of money by those two governments?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I answer the gentleman that many things enter into good times and bad times, that this is a very big world, that its condition at any one time is the resultant not springing from one nation but from all nations. All nations contributed to the period of depression to which the gentleman referred, each in its own way, and we contributed most seriously by our obstructive tariff, which refused to allow our people to exchange their products which they would have been glad to sell for the products of other nations, which these nations were able to produce at a less cost than we were able to produce the same articles. Next to the destructions caused by the civil war that was the chief cause of that long period of depression. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. Had Germany or England a prohibitory or destructive tariff at that time, and did not both suffer in common with us?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. They suffered from our inability to consume, and our inability to consume was the result of a bad financial system coupled with our obstructive tariff. [Applause.]

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman now permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Certainly. The House has kindly extended my time, and I shall be glad to answer any question gentlemen desire to ask.

Mr. BRUMM. As I understand it, the gentleman from New York has stated that the tariff prevents the interchange of our commercial articles with foreign nations; in other words, that it has prevented us from sending abroad those articles which we produce to receive in return those which we consume. Now, the question is this, Did that tariff interfere in any manner to prevent the farmers of the West, who had their corn piled up by millions of bushels, from exchanging their corn with the coal mines of the East, who had their coal piled up I might say by millions of tons almost, between whom there was no tariff and no obstruction to traffic? Did the tariff prevent the interchange of those commodities, the miners of the East starving for the corn, and the farmers of the West freezing for the coal?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Really I do not know why the farmers in the West, whose farms are near the great coal fields which underlie the State of Illinois, almost the entire State, also great portions of Indiana and of Iowa and a considerable part of Missouri and Kansas, in all of which States vast bodies of coal are known to exist—I say I do not know why they should be so exceedingly anxious to exchange their produce for that commodity derived from the East, when they have it at their own doors in superabundance and profusion. It would be "carrying coals to New Castle."

Mr. SPRINGER. There is coal enough in my own district to supply Pennsylvania for a thousand years.

Mr. WHITE. And enough in Kentucky to accomplish the same.

Mr. BRUMM. But how does the gentleman from New York answer the proposition on the part of the miners who were starving for the corn?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I answered that question some time ago, but I may as well take this occasion to answer another statement made by the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON,] that our labor was better employed at the present time than labor in England.

The coal miners in Pennsylvania to-day are working only on half time, or else are on a strike, there being but few coal mines there now worked on full time. From my personal knowledge I am enabled to state that the coal miners of that region are absolutely suffering for the comforts of life for themselves and their families, the result of this stoppage of work. The condition of these coal miners is the fruit of a protective system, a system that has built up an unnatural industry, for the product of which there is no sale in foreign markets at the unnatural cost of production. If they could sell this coal the miners would be at work, and there would be comfort among them instead of despair.

But I will go a step further. The gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON,] in the course of his remarks upon this bill, made a comparison between the condition of this industry in England and here. He properly took the article of coal as his standard of civilization and progress. By the returns just received for 1891, I find the number of tons of coal mined to be 154,184,300 tons, against 146,969,409 in 1880, showing an increase of 7,214,891 tons. There was also an increase of the iron ore of 194,040 tons. The increase in the number of hands employed is stated at 10,544 in the coal and iron business, showing that the coal and iron business is greatly improving and on

the increase in Great Britain. To prove that England is not retrograding, I annex a table prepared by Mr. Mulhall, an eminent statistician, which proves that in all the leading lines of business there has been a steady increase of exports, and that the year 1880 is the best year for activity in business which Great Britain has ever known:

*Increase of British exports—average annual exportations.*

| Exports.                         | Decade ending 1870. | Decade ending 1880. | Year 1881. |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Coal.....tons..                  | 9,600,000           | 15,050,000          | 19,070,000 |
| Iron.....tons..                  | 1,760,000           | 7,730,000           | 3,710,000  |
| Steel.....hundred weights..      | 880,000             | 980,000             | 1,680,000  |
| Copper.....tons..                | 36,000              | 43,000              | 52,000     |
| Sugar.....tons..                 | 12,300              | 45,000              | 48,000     |
| Leather.....tons..               | 3,200               | 8,600               | 7,400      |
| Soap.....tons..                  | 9,000               | 13,500              | 19,600     |
| Cotton cloth.....million yards.. | 2,400               | 3,700               | 4,490      |
| Woolen cloth.....million yards.. | 255                 | 302                 | 263        |
| Jute cloth.....million yards..   | 30                  | 115                 | 183        |
| Linen cloth.....million yards..  | 203                 | 190                 | 165        |
| Silk cloth.....million yards..   | 3                   | 4½                  | 6½         |
| Books.....tons..                 | 2,150               | 4,100               | 5,000      |
| Porcelain.....value..            | £1,500,000          | £1,800,000          | £2,100,000 |
| Machinery.....value..            | £4,700,000          | £8,000,000          | £9,300,000 |

I am sorry to say, however, that the product of coal, which measures the progress of industry, is falling off in this country at the present time.

Mr. KELLEY. Of anthracite, not bituminous.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. It applies to both. The other coal product increased somewhat, but now, since the strikes, the product of bituminous coal is falling off; and the cause of these strikes in Ohio at least is that whereas the miners were receiving seventy-five cents per ton for mining the coal and putting it on cars, the operators have attempted to reduce the figures to sixty-five cents, and the strikers are therefore not strikes for an advance, but against a reduction of wages. If gentlemen have any doubt about the matter I will quote the authority.

Mr. BRUMM. Is it not a fact that the anthracite region was worked all of last winter, a matter unknown heretofore, and, by reason of that, overstocked the market?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Not overstocked the market. I am interested in the anthracite business myself, and am familiar with its details.

Mr. BRUMM. I am aware of that; I know it to be a fact. But is it not true, as I have stated, that this anthracite region was working all of last winter?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. No; in the anthracite region we have been working on half time ever since Congress met.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio. Will the gentleman from New York state what the duty is on anthracite coal?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. There is no duty on anthracite coal. I want to keep it free.

Mr. UPDEGRAFF, of Ohio. Then this article at all events comes in under a free-trade system.

Mr. BRUMM. Because there is no anthracite coal produced anywhere else.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. South Wales is full of it. I have been in South Wales myself, and know the fact.

Mr. KELLEY. The Welsh people do not seem to be aware of it.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Wales has a considerable iron industry dependent on anthracite, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought to know it, because it is used for the manufacture of pig-iron. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. There is no pure anthracite coal in Wales.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. There is a large quantity of anthracite in Wales; I have been in the mines.

Mr. KELLEY. Of what is called anthracite?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. The gentleman's pet industry was built up on the experience of Mr. Crane, of Wales, and in Wales, whose manager and bookkeeper, Mr. David Thomas, came out and built the first furnace in Pennsylvania, making use of anthracite.

Mr. KELLEY. And Mr. David Thomas has told me he never saw anthracite coal in Wales.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. And the same Mr. David Thomas will be very much disgusted to hear this statement, for it is the chief glory of his honorable career, and he has often repeated to me the story of this great discovery and experience with Mr. Crane in the use of anthracite coal.

Mr. BRUMM. There is in Wales a coal that is semi-anthracite or semi-bituminous, but it is not pure anthracite.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not want to be interrupted on a question of fact which I know, and I repeat that there is plenty of anthracite coal in Wales, that it is not semi-anthracite and that it is not semi-bituminous.

Our capacity to produce is now fully equal to our own wants, and in most branches of business there are already indications that the demand is not fully equal to the supply. If the surplus when it comes cannot get an outlet, then it will not be produced, and a portion of our labor will be unemployed, and no increase in the tariff,

not even if the existing rates of duty were doubled, would provide an adequate remedy in such an emergency. The laboring classes, therefore, have nothing to expect or gain from protective tariffs, but they have everything to gain by removing every possible obstruction to the extension of business imposed by the existing tariff, and by the removal of taxes upon what they consume, and by a transfer of the burdens of government, so far as may be practicable, from those who actually produce its wealth to those who own the fixed capital of the country and are the consumers of luxuries. In other words, in revising the tariff, taxation should be made to fall as far as possible upon the rich, and removed from the articles consumed by the working classes. Hence I would not tax tea, coffee, or tobacco. I would reduce the duties on common sugar, and by the removal of duties on raw materials, cheapen clothing, and all articles which are consumed by the working classes. Thus may we in a measure prepare for the great alterations which are impending and will change the face of the world from causes more powerful than any mere human devices, bringing about the time when all trade shall be free, and all men shall be brothers—

When the war-drums throb no longer,  
And the battle-flags are furled,  
In the parliament of man,  
The federation of the world.

This transition may either be gradual and natural, or, if we attempt to dam up the stream of progress, it may come by a convulsion which will shatter the very frame-work of society. If the change is provided for by intelligent legislation we shall begin by exporting our coarse cottons, as we did before the war; we shall extend the foreign markets for our admirable products of steel and iron in the form of labor-saving machines, and gradually supplant England in the markets of the world, with the productions which we can turn out at a less cost in labor than will be possible for her to do, after paying freights on our raw cotton and our food. The primacy of industry will be transferred gradually but steadily from the Old World to the New, and free trade will give us the markets of the world which are now controlled by the mother country, and this without impairing our ability to pay the higher rate of wages due to cheaper food, lower taxes, and greater personal intelligence in work.

LYON PLAYFAIR.

That this anticipation is not illusory, let me adduce the testimony of Dr. Lyon Playfair, the deputy speaker of the House of Commons, and one of the highest living authorities in the laws of industrial progress. I quote from the February number of Macmillan's Magazine, in which he sums up the results of his observations on our industries during his recent visit to the United States. He says:

No one expects a speedy recognition of the advantages of free trade, nor is it to be desired. When a man has been walking on crutches they must not suddenly be pulled away from him. England does not suffer so much from the protective policy of the United States as she believes. The protective duties of America remove from us the most formidable competitor in the markets of the world by raising its prices of production. They protect England in all neutral markets, and enable us to send even into the United States £25,000,000 of manufactured goods, while they return to us less than £3,000,000. It is impossible not to foresee that the United States will, in the end, be the great manufacturing country of the world; but they cannot assume this position under their present fiscal policy, and the final consummation will, in any case, be immensely retarded by the endless evils, which spread like weeds over a country where a protective policy has long prevailed.

It is these weeds which, by judicious steps of reform, slowly but intelligently pursued, I hope to eradicate, and some of these steps, the safe and sure steps, I want to take without any delay whatever.

CONCLUSION.

But let us reverse the picture, and see what is likely to happen in case we delay the reforms in the tariff, which are demanded by both political parties, and by every consideration of public interest. If good harvests should be secured abroad we shall have a great surplus of food upon our hands and the price will fall; wages will go down with the fall in price; the reduction of wages will be resisted by strikes and lockouts; the conflicts between capital and labor will be reopened, and indeed have already begun; the prosperity of the country will be arrested; railroad transportation will fall off; new railroads will cease to be constructed; our shops will lack work; there will be a dearth of employment all over the country; the volume of immigration will fall off, and the career of expansion and general development will be brought to a disastrous conclusion; the sad experience of 1873-79 will be repeated until through the gate of suffering, poverty, and want, we shall establish a lower rate of wages and the products of the country, weighted as they are with obstructive taxes, which must be deducted from the wages of labor, will force their way into the open markets of the world in spite of the tariff. We shall then reach the era of free trade, but on conditions which will deprive this generation of workmen of all the benefits which they would have derived from it, if the way had been properly prepared for its final triumph. The result cannot be arrested, but with wise statesmanship the transition may be made not only without disaster or suffering but with positive benefit to the general welfare. With a failure, however, to comprehend the situation it will come through convulsions and revolutions, from the suffering and horrors of which I prefer to turn away in silence.

But there is one aspect of the case to which I cannot shut my eyes. The whole structure and genius of our Government must be changed in order to meet the primary necessity which will thus arise for preserving social order. With the general occurrence of



strikes and lockouts will come, as in the case of the railroad riots in 1877, the demand upon the Federal Government for the presence of its troops to maintain order and put down violence and mobs; force will be met with force; a larger standing Army will be demanded by public opinion and conceded by Congress; the power and rights of the States will be subordinated to the superior vigor and resources of the National Government; the duties of governors will be merged into the prerogative of the President. With a large standing Army acting as a national police, under the direction of an Executive whose authority will thus be as omnipotent as his troops will be omnipresent the era of free government will have passed away, and the reign of despotism will have commenced. The sacred privileges of individual citizens will be lost in the general demand for a strong government, and all that freedom has gained by the heroic struggles of our forefathers for a thousand years, and by our resistance to tyranny for three centuries in the New World, will be

put in peril. Such a calamity ought never to come to pass, and it never will come unless this generation of men and the representatives of this generation upon this floor fail to comprehend the spirit and the warnings of the time; when capital and labor, mobilized by the discovery of new laws of force and by the progress of invention, demand and will secure the same free interchange for their products which they have already achieved for themselves; when all thoughtful men now see and know that the "glad tidings of great joy," proclaimed two thousand years ago, "of peace on earth and good-will toward men," are, after the lapse of ages, to be made a reality, through the untrammelled intercourse of men and nations with each other, bringing to naught and utterly confounding the doctrine born of passion, prejudice, and ignorance, which regards men as natural enemies, instead of proclaiming them to be the children of the same Heavenly Father, "whose service is perfect freedom." [Great applause.]

*Weekly rates of wages in the principal cities of Europe, compiled from consular reports, and compared with rates in New York and Chicago.*

| Occupation.                      | Belgium.  | France.   | Germany. | Italy. | Spain.     | Switzerland. | United Kingdom. | United States.     |                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                                  | Brussels. | Bordeaux. | Dresden. | Rome.  | Barcelona. | Geneva.      | Liverpool.      | New York.          | Chicago.          |
| House-building trades:           |           |           |          |        |            |              |                 |                    |                   |
| Bricklayers.....                 | \$6 00    | \$4 80    |          | \$3 00 | \$5 40     | \$4 80       | \$9 25          | \$12 00 to \$15 00 | \$6 00 to \$10 50 |
| Carpenters and joiners.....      | 5 40      | 5 00      | \$3 75   | 3 00   | 5 00       | 6 00         | 9 00            | 9 00 to 12 00      | 7 50 to 12 00     |
| Gas-fitters.....                 | 5 40      |           |          |        |            | 4 60         | 7 80            | 10 00 to 14 00     | 10 00 to 12 00    |
| Masons.....                      | 6 00      | 5 40      | 3 75     | 3 00   |            | 4 80         | 8 70            | 12 00 to 18 00     | 12 00 to 15 00    |
| Painters.....                    |           |           |          |        |            | 4 60         | 8 50            | 10 00 to 16 00     | 6 00 to 12 00     |
| Plasterers.....                  | 5 40      |           |          |        |            | 4 60         | 9 72            | 10 00 to 15 00     | 9 00 to 15 00     |
| Plumbers.....                    | 6 00      | 6 00      |          |        |            | 4 60         | 9 00            | 12 00 to 18 00     | 12 00 to 20 00    |
| Slaters.....                     |           |           |          |        |            | 4 60         | 9 72            | 10 00 to 15 00     | 12 00 to 18 00    |
| General trades:                  |           |           |          |        |            |              |                 |                    |                   |
| Bakers.....                      | 6 00      | 4 80      | 3 50     |        | 5 40       | 4 80         |                 | 5 00 to 8 00       | 8 00 to 12 00     |
| Blacksmiths.....                 | 6 00      | 4 80      | 4 00     | 3 30   | 4 50       | 4 80         | 8 80            | 10 00 to 14 00     | 9 00 to 12 00     |
| Bookbinders.....                 | 6 00      | 4 80      | 2 00     |        | 3 60       | 4 60         | 8 00            | 12 00 to 18 00     | 9 00 to 20 00     |
| Brassfounders.....               |           |           | 3 00     | 4 75   | 6 00       |              | 7 20            | 10 00 to 14 00     | 8 00 to 15 00     |
| Butchers.....                    | 6 00      | 6 00      | 4 60     |        |            | 4 60         |                 | 8 00 to 12 00      | 12 00 to 18 00    |
| Cabinet-makers.....              | 4 80      |           |          |        | 4 20       | 6 00         | 8 00            | 9 00 to 13 00      | 7 00 to 15 00     |
| Coopers.....                     | 6 00      | 8 00      |          |        | 5 50       | 4 60         | 8 75            | 12 00 to 16 00     | 6 00 to 15 00     |
| Coppersmiths.....                | 6 00      |           | 4 75     |        |            | 4 60         | 8 90            | 12 00 to 16 00     | 15 00 to 20 00    |
| Cutlers.....                     | 5 50      | 4 20      | 4 00     |        |            | 4 60         |                 | 10 00 to 13 00     | 15 00 to 10 00    |
| Engravers.....                   | 6 00      |           |          |        |            | 4 80         |                 | 15 00 to 25 00     | 9 00 to 30 00     |
| Horseshoers.....                 | 6 00      | 4 80      |          |        |            |              | 8 50            | 12 00 to 18 00     | 15 00 to 25 00    |
| Millwrights.....                 |           |           |          |        |            |              | 7 70            | 10 00 to 15 00     | 12 00 to 20 00    |
| Printers.....                    | 6 00      | 3 00      |          |        | 4 80       | 4 60         | 10 50           | 8 00 to 18 00      | 12 00 to 18 00    |
| Saddlers and harness-makers..... | 4 80      | 4 80      |          |        |            | 4 60         | 7 30            | 12 00 to 15 00     | 6 00 to 12 00     |
| Sailmakers.....                  | 6 00      |           |          |        |            |              |                 | 12 00 to 18 00     | 12 00 to 15 00    |
| Shoemakers.....                  | 6 00      | 4 20      | 2 00     | 3 60   | 3 60       | 4 60         | 8 75            | 12 00 to 18 00     | 9 00 to 18 00     |
| Tailors.....                     | 6 00      | 4 80      | 3 00     | 3 60   | 3 60       | 4 80         |                 | 12 00 to 18 00     | 6 00 to 18 00     |
| Tinsmiths.....                   | 4 80      | 4 80      | 3 00     |        | 4 00       | 4 80         | 7 50            | 10 00 to 14 00     | 9 00 to 12 00     |
| Laborers, porters, &c.....       | 3 50      |           | 2 50     |        |            | 3 00         | 5 82            | 6 00 to 9 00       | 5 50 to 9 00      |

*Statement showing weekly rates of wages in the several countries, compiled from consular reports, and compared with rates prevailing in United States.*

| Occupations.                         | Belgium. | Denmark. | France. | Germany. | Italy. | Spain. | United Kingdom. |          |              | United States.     |                   |
|--------------------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|--------|--------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                                      |          |          |         |          |        |        | England.        | Ireland. | Scotland.    | New York.          | Chicago.          |
| Agricultural laborers:               |          |          |         |          |        |        |                 |          |              |                    |                   |
| Men, without board or lodging.....   |          |          | \$3 15  | \$2 87   | \$3 50 |        | \$3 60          | \$3 40   | \$4 25       |                    |                   |
| Men, with board and lodging.....     |          |          | 1 56    | 1 48     | 1 80   |        | 2 60            | 1 30     | 2 40         |                    |                   |
| Women, without board or lodging..... |          |          | 1 10    | 1 08     | 1 55   |        | 1 80            | 2 16     | 1 80 to 3 25 |                    |                   |
| Women, with board and lodging.....   |          |          |         | 75       | 60     |        | 1 15            | 75       | 60 to 1 00   |                    |                   |
| House-building trades:               |          |          |         |          |        |        |                 |          |              |                    |                   |
| Bricklayers.....                     | \$6 00   |          | 4 00    | 3 60     | 3 45   | \$5 12 | 8 12            | 7 58     | 9 63         | \$12 00 to \$15 00 | \$6 00 to \$10 50 |
| Carpenters and joiners.....          | 5 40     | \$4 25   | 5 42    | 4 00     | 4 18   | 4 88   | 8 25            | 7 33     | 8 12         | 9 00 to 12 00      | 7 50 to 12 00     |
| Gas-fitters.....                     | 5 40     |          |         | 3 65     | 3 95   |        | 7 25            | 7 95     | 8 40         | 10 00 to 14 00     | 10 00 to 12 00    |
| Masons.....                          | 6 00     | 4 45     | 5 00    | 4 30     | 4 00   | 4 80   | 8 16            | 7 58     | 8 28         | 12 00 to 18 00     | 12 00 to 15 00    |
| Painters.....                        | 4 20     | 4 15     | 4 90    | 3 92     | 4 60   |        | 7 25            | 7 54     | 8 16         | 10 00 to 16 00     | 6 00 to 12 00     |
| Plasterers.....                      | 5 40     |          |         | 3 80     | 4 35   | 7 20   | 8 10            | 7 68     | 10 13        | 10 00 to 15 00     | 9 00 to 15 00     |
| Plumbers.....                        | 6 00     |          | 5 50    | 3 60     | 3 90   |        | 7 75            | 8 46     | 7 13         | 12 00 to 18 00     | 12 00 to 20 00    |
| Slaters.....                         |          |          |         | 4 00     | 3 90   |        | 7 90            |          | 8 30         | 10 00 to 15 00     | 12 00 to 18 00    |
| General trades:                      |          |          |         |          |        |        |                 |          |              |                    |                   |
| Bakers.....                          | 4 40     | 4 25     | 5 55    | 3 50     | 3 90   | 5 40   | 6 50            |          | 6 60         | 5 00 to 8 00       | 8 00 to 12 00     |
| Blacksmiths.....                     | 4 40     | 3 90     | 5 45    | 3 55     | 3 94   | 4 65   | 8 12            |          | 7 04         | 10 00 to 14 00     | 9 00 to 12 00     |
| Bookbinders.....                     |          | 3 72     | 4 85    | 3 82     | 3 90   | 3 60   | 7 83            |          | 6 50         | 12 00 to 18 00     | 9 00 to 20 00     |
| Brassfounders.....                   |          | 4 20     |         | 3 20     | 5 49   |        | 7 40            |          | 6 90         | 10 00 to 14 00     | 8 00 to 15 00     |
| Butchers.....                        | 4 50     | 4 50     | 5 42    | 3 85     | 4 20   |        | 7 23            |          | 4 75         | 8 00 to 12 00      | 12 00 to 18 00    |
| Cabinet-makers.....                  | 4 80     |          | 6 00    | 3 97     | 4 95   | 4 20   | 7 70            |          | 8 48         | 9 00 to 13 00      | 7 00 to 15 00     |
| Coopers.....                         |          | 4 10     | 7 00    | 3 30     | 4 35   | 4 95   | 7 30            |          | 6 10         | 12 00 to 16 00     | 6 00 to 15 00     |
| Coppersmiths.....                    |          | 3 85     |         | 3 30     | 3 90   |        | 7 40            |          | 7 10         | 12 00 to 16 00     | 15 00 to 20 00    |
| Cutlers.....                         |          | 3 85     | 4 63    | 4 00     | 3 90   |        | 8 00            |          | 6 25         | 10 00 to 13 00     | 15 00 to 10 00    |
| Engravers.....                       |          |          |         | 4 00     | 4 00   |        | 9 72            |          | 7 75         | 15 00 to 25 00     | 9 00 to 30 00     |
| Horseshoers.....                     |          | 3 85     | 5 40    | 3 25     | 3 50   |        | 7 20            |          | 7 00         | 12 00 to 18 00     | 15 00 to 25 00    |
| Millwrights.....                     |          | 4 00     |         | 3 30     | 4 95   |        | 7 50            |          | 7 50         | 10 00 to 15 00     | 12 00 to 20 00    |
| Printers.....                        |          | 4 62     | 4 70    | 4 80     | 3 90   |        | 7 75            |          | 7 52         | 8 00 to 18 00      | 12 00 to 18 00    |
| Saddlers and harness-makers.....     | 4 80     | 3 85     | 5 00    | 3 60     | 3 90   |        | 6 89            |          | 6 15         | 12 00 to 15 00     | 6 00 to 12 00     |
| Sailmakers.....                      |          | 4 85     |         | 3 30     | 3 90   |        | 7 30            |          | 6 33         | 12 00 to 18 00     | 12 00 to 15 00    |
| Shoemakers.....                      |          | 3 30     | 4 75    | 3 12     | 4 32   | 3 90   | 7 35            |          | 7 35         | 12 00 to 18 00     | 9 00 to 18 00     |
| Tailors.....                         |          | 4 10     | 5 10    | 3 58     | 4 30   | 3 90   | \$5 00 to 7 30  |          | 7 00         | 10 00 to 18 00     | 6 00 to 18 00     |
| Tinsmiths.....                       | 4 80     | 3 90     | 4 40    | 3 65     | 3 60   | 3 90   | 7 30            |          | 6 00         | 10 00 to 14 00     | 9 00 to 12 00     |
| Laborers, porters, &c.....           | 3 00     |          |         | 2 92     | 2 60   | 3 00   | 5 00            |          | 4 50         | 6 00 to 9 00       | 5 50 to 9 00      |
| Railway employés:                    |          |          |         |          |        |        |                 |          |              |                    |                   |
| Engineers, passenger trains.....     |          |          | 11 33   | 8 35     | 9 50   |        | 9 12            | 9 00     | 8 70         |                    |                   |
| Firemen, passenger trains.....       |          |          | 6 25    | 3 30     | 4 50   |        | 6 00            | 4 50     | 4 96         |                    |                   |
| Brakemen, passenger trains.....      |          |          | 3 60    | 3 22     |        |        | 5 50            | 4 00     | 4 69         |                    |                   |
| Signal-men.....                      |          |          | 5 85    | 3 52     | 4 00   |        | 5 60            | 5 00     | 5 12         |                    |                   |
| Switchmen.....                       |          |          | 5 50    | 3 41     | 4 00   |        | 5 60            | 5 00     | 5 19         |                    |                   |
| Porters.....                         |          |          | 5 00    | 2 60     | 3 40   |        | 4 50            | 4 00     | 4 44         |                    |                   |
| Laborers.....                        |          |          | 3 35    | 3 10     | 3 30   |        | 4 50            | 4 00     | 4 27         |                    |                   |

Statement showing the retail prices of the necessities of life in the several countries, compiled from consular reports published herewith, and compared with prices in New York and Chicago.

| Articles.                    | Belgium.      | France.  | Germany.      | Italy.   | Spain.          | Switzerland. | United Kingdom.  |          |           | United States.   |                  |
|------------------------------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------|-----------|------------------|------------------|
|                              |               |          |               |          |                 |              | England.         | Ireland. | Scotland. | New York.        | Chicago.         |
| Bread.....per pound..        | Cents. 4 to 5 | Cents. 3 | Cents. 3 to 7 | Cents. 6 | Cents. 6½ to 7½ | Cents. 4     | Cents. 3½ to 4½  | Cents. 4 | Cents. 4  | Cents. 4 to 4½   | Cents. 4 to 4½   |
| Flour.....do.....            | 4             | 4        | 5½            | 10       | 18              | 7            | 3½ to 4½         | 4        | 4         | 3 to 4           | 2½ to 4½         |
| Beef:                        |               |          |               |          |                 |              |                  |          |           |                  |                  |
| Roasting.....per pound..     | 20            | 22       | 22            | 20       | 30              | 22           | 22               | 22       | 22        | 12 to 16         | 8 to 12½         |
| Soup.....do.....             | 16            | 16       | 14            | 12       | 18              | 15           | 15               | 16       | 16        | 6 to 8           | 5 to 8           |
| Rump steak.....do.....       | 20            | 20       | 20            | 20       | 30              | 26½          | 26½              | 26½      | 26½       | 14 to 16         | 8 to 12½         |
| Corned.....do.....           | 16            | 16       | 13            | 12       | 18              | 18           | 18               | 20       | 20        | 8 to 12          | 4 to 7           |
| Veal:                        |               |          |               |          |                 |              |                  |          |           |                  |                  |
| Fore quarter.....per pound.. | 16            | 16       | 14            | 15       | 25              | 18           | 18               | 22½      | 25        | 8 to 10          | 6 to 10          |
| Hind quarter.....do.....     | 18            | 20       | 22            | 20       | 20              | 18           | 22½              | 25       | 30        | 10 to 12         | 10 to 12         |
| Cutlets.....do.....          | 20            | 22       | 22            | 22       | 20              | 20           | 27               | 30       | 30        | 20 to 24         | 12½ to 15        |
| Mutton:                      |               |          |               |          |                 |              |                  |          |           |                  |                  |
| Fore quarter.....per pound.. | 16            | 16       | 14½           | 15       | 14              | 17           | 17               | 16       | 16        | 9 to 10          | 5 to 12½         |
| Hind quarter.....do.....     | 20            | 18       | 18            | 18       | 18              | 22           | 22               | 20       | 20        | 12 to 14         | 5 to 15½         |
| Chops.....do.....            | 20            | 20       | 18            | 18       | 18              | 25           | 25               | 24       | 24        | 14 to 16         | 10 to 15         |
| Pork:                        |               |          |               |          |                 |              |                  |          |           |                  |                  |
| Fresh.....per pound..        | 16            | 14       | 17            | 13       | 24              | 18           | 16               | 10 to 12 | 13 to 16  | 8 to 10          | 4 to 5           |
| Salted.....do.....           | 16            | 14       | 17            | 13       | 20              | 20           | 15               | 10 to 12 | 13 to 16  | 8 to 10          | 6 to 12          |
| Bacon.....do.....            | 18            | 20       | 20            | 22       | 23              | 23           | 12 to 15         | 15       | 15        | 8 to 10          | 7 to 12          |
| Ham.....do.....              | 25            | 25       | 22            | 25       | 45              | 28           | 13 to 23         | 25       | 25        | 8 to 12          | 7 to 15          |
| Shoulder.....do.....         | 20            | 18       | 20            | 20       | 20              | 12           | 12               | 8        | 8         | 8 to 10          | 4 to 10          |
| Sausage.....do.....          | 20            | 16       | 19            | 20       | 20              | 18           | 18               | 8        | 8         | 8 to 10          | 6 to 10          |
| Lard.....do.....             | 20            | 20       | 21            | 22       | 21              | 15           | 15 to 18         | 12       | 12        | 10 to 12         | 6 to 10          |
| Codfish.....do.....          | 20            | 20       | 21            | 22       | 21              | 8            | 8                | 8        | 8         | 6 to 7           | 5 to 9           |
| Butter.....do.....           | 20 to 25      | 25       | 22            | 28       | 45              | 36           | 29 to 38         | 20½      | 32        | 25 to 32         | 16 to 40         |
| Cheese.....do.....           | 20 to 25      | 25       | 24            | 26       | 28              | 23           | 15 to 21         | 20       | 20        | 12 to 15         | 5 to 16          |
| Potatoes.....per bushel..    | 56            | 50       | 50            | \$1 15   | \$1 10          | 60           | \$1 12 to \$2 00 | 68       | 95        | \$1 40 to \$1 60 | 60 to 80         |
| Rice.....do.....             | 9             | 9        | 9             | 6        | 7               | 7            | 8                | 8        | 5         | 8 to 10          | 5 to 10          |
| Beans.....per quart..        | 10            | 10       | 10            | 13       | 12              | 9            | 9                | 9        | 5         | 7 to 10          | 5 to 9           |
| Milk.....do.....             | 4             | 4        | 4             | 7        | 7               | 5            | 6 to 9           | 9        | 5         | 8 to 10          | 3 to 6           |
| Eggs.....per dozen..         | 20 to 25      | 18       | 20            | 18       | 20 to 25        | 20           | 19 to 30         | 14       | 28        | 25 to 30         | 10 to 24         |
| Oatmeal.....per pound..      | 8             | 8        | 8             | 8        | 8               | 3½           | 3½ to 4½         | 3½       | 4         | 4 to 5           | 4 to 5           |
| Tea.....do.....              | 75            | 75       | 75            | 75       | 70              | 50           | 43 to 88         | 80       | 70 to 88  | 50 to 60         | 25 to \$1 00     |
| Coffee.....do.....           | 30 to 40      | 30       | 35            | 32       | 45              | 30           | 28 to 42         | 8        | 32 to 50  | 20 to 30         | 16 to 40         |
| Sugar.....do.....            | 15 to 20      | 11       | 8½            | 11       | 8               | 5½           | 5½ to 9          | 8        | 10        | 8 to 10          | 7 to 10          |
| Molasses.....per gallon..    |               |          |               |          |                 |              |                  |          |           | 60 to 70         | 40 to 80         |
| Soap.....per pound..         |               |          | 10            | 4        | 10              | 5½           | 5½ to 9          |          |           | 6 to 7           | 3 to 8           |
| Starch.....do.....           |               |          | 9             | 10       | 10              | 10           | 10 to 12         |          | 14        | 8 to 10          | 5 to 10          |
| Coal.....per ton.....        |               | \$4 25   | \$11 00       |          | \$9 00          |              | \$3 20 to \$4 10 |          | \$2 65    | \$3 00 to \$5 25 | \$3 00 to \$6 75 |

Statement showing the retail prices of the necessities of life in the principal cities of Europe, compiled from consular reports, and compared with same in New York and Chicago.

| Articles.                    | Belgium.      | France.       | Germany. | Italy.   | Spain.     | Switzerland. | United Kingdom.  | United States.   |                  |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|----------|------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                              | Brussels.     | Bordeaux.     | Dresden. | Rome.    | Barcelona. | Geneva.      | Liverpool.       | New York.        | Chicago.         |
| Bread.....per pound..        | Cents. 4 to 5 | Cents. 3 to 4 | Cents. 7 | Cents. 6 | Cents. 6½  | Cents. 4     | Cents. 3½ to 4   | Cents. 4 to 4½   | Cents. 4 to 4½   |
| Flour.....do.....            | 4             | 4             | 6        | 10       | 6½         | 7            | 3½ to 5          | 3 to 4           | 2½ to 4½         |
| Beef:                        |               |               |          |          |            |              |                  |                  |                  |
| Roasting.....per pound..     | 20            | 20            | 24       | 20       | 20         | 30           | 22               | 12 to 16         | 8 to 12½         |
| Soup.....do.....             | 16            | 16            | 18       | 12       | 15         | 18           | 16               | 6 to 8           | 5 to 8           |
| Rump.....do.....             | 18            | 18            | 19       | 15       | 18         | 25           | 18               | 14 to 16         | 8 to 12½         |
| Corned.....do.....           | 16            | 16            | 18       | 12       | 18         | 18           | 16               | 8 to 12          | 4 to 7           |
| Veal:                        |               |               |          |          |            |              |                  |                  |                  |
| Fore quarter.....per pound.. | 16            | 16            | 12       | 15       | 15         | 14           | 14               | 8 to 10          | 6 to 10          |
| Hind quarter.....do.....     | 18            | 20            | 18       | 20       | 18         | 18           | 20               | 10 to 12         | 10 to 12         |
| Cutlets.....do.....          | 20            | 22            | 18       | 22       | 22         | 20           | 20               | 20 to 24         | 12½ to 15        |
| Mutton:                      |               |               |          |          |            |              |                  |                  |                  |
| Fore quarter.....per pound.. | 16            | 16            | 12       | 15       | 12         | 14           | 14               | 9 to 10          | 5 to 12½         |
| Hind quarter.....do.....     | 18            | 20            | 18       | 18       | 15         | 18           | 20               | 12 to 14         | 5 to 15½         |
| Chops.....do.....            | 20            | 20            | 18       | 18       | 18         | 20           | 20               | 14 to 16         | 10 to 15         |
| Pork:                        |               |               |          |          |            |              |                  |                  |                  |
| Fresh.....per pound..        | 16            | 12            | 18       | 15       | 20         | 18           | 16               | 8 to 10          | 4 to 8           |
| Salted.....do.....           | 16            | 14            | 18       | 18       | 20         | 20           | 16               | 8 to 10          | 6 to 12          |
| Bacon.....do.....            | 18            | 20            | 30       | 25       | 30         | 20           | 20               | 8 to 10          | 7 to 12          |
| Ham.....do.....              | 20            | 25            | 35       | 30       | 40         | 28           | 24               | 8 to 12          | 7 to 15          |
| Shoulder.....do.....         | 16            | 16            | 30       | 25       | 30         | 16           | 16               | 8 to 10          | 4 to 10          |
| Sausage.....do.....          | 18            | 16            | 20       | 20       | 20         | 20           | 20               | 8 to 10          | 6 to 10          |
| Lard.....do.....             | 20            | 20            | 20       | 25       | 19         | 16           | 16               | 10 to 12         | 6 to 10          |
| Codfish.....do.....          | 20            | 20            | 20       | 10       | 9          | 8            | 8                | 6 to 7           | 5 to 9           |
| Butter.....do.....           | 20 to 25      | 25            | 16       | 30       | 40         | 36           | 24 to 36         | 25 to 32         | 16 to 40         |
| Cheese.....do.....           | 20 to 25      | 25            | 33       | 28       | 25         | 23           | 12 to 20         | 12 to 15         | 5 to 16          |
| Potatoes.....per bushel..    | 56            | 60            | 48       | \$1 20   | \$1 00     | 60           | \$1 20 to \$1 50 | \$1 40 to \$1 60 | 60 to 80         |
| Rice.....do.....             | 9             | 9             | 10       | 5        | 6½         | 7            | 4 to 10          | 8 to 10          | 5 to 10          |
| Beans.....per quart..        | 10            | 10            | 14       | 15       | 12         | 9            | 9                | 7 to 10          | 5 to 9           |
| Milk.....do.....             | 4             | 4             | 4        | 7        | 7          | 5            | 6 to 8           | 8 to 10          | 3 to 6           |
| Eggs.....per dozen..         | 20 to 25      | 10 to 15      | 20       | 20       | 20         | 20           | 14 to 18         | 25 to 30         | 10 to 24         |
| Oatmeal.....per pound..      | 8             | 8             | 8        | 8        | 8          | 3½           | 3½ to 4          | 4 to 5           | 4 to 5           |
| Tea.....do.....              | 75            | 75            | 75       | 75       | 70         | 50           | 40 to 85         | 50 to 60         | 25 to \$1 00     |
| Coffee.....do.....           | 30 to 40      | 30            | 38       | 40       | 40         | 30           | 24 to 40         | 20 to 30         | 15 to 40         |
| Sugar.....do.....            | 15 to 20      | 11            | 12       | 8        | 10         | 8            | 5 to 8           | 8 to 10          | 7 to 10          |
| Molasses.....per gallon..    |               |               |          |          |            |              |                  | 60 to 70         | 40 to 80         |
| Soap.....per pound..         |               |               | 4        | 9        | 9          | 4            | 4 to 10          | 6 to 7           | 3 to 8           |
| Starch.....do.....           |               |               | 10       | 10       | 10         | 10           | 10 to 12         | 8 to 10          | 5 to 10          |
| Coal.....per ton.....        |               | \$3 10        | \$11 00  | \$9 00   |            |              | \$3 65 to \$4 38 | \$3 00 to \$5 25 | \$3 00 to \$6 75 |

## SHEFFIELD.

[Report, by Consul Webster, on (1) rates of wages, (2) cost of living, (3) present state of trade, (4) habits of the workmen and workingwomen, for the district of Sheffield.]

Referring to the Department circular of April 11, 1878, requiring information upon certain subjects, I beg to present the following report:

## 1. RATES OF WAGES.

The rates of wages in most of the Sheffield trades have been kept up to the stand-

ard of five years ago, and in many cases they have been advanced, notwithstanding the great depression in business. But, although the rates have advanced, the amounts actually earned are much diminished, from the fact that there is so much less work to be done. The fact must be considered, however, that men can now earn larger amounts in a given time than in former years on account of the increased facilities, which enable them to work more rapidly. For instance, the steel for round, half-round, flat, and three-square files was formerly made square, and the file-forged was obliged to hammer it into the required shape. The same was true of steel for cutlery, including razors, edge-tools, and many other articles.



Now the steel comes to the hand of the forger from the manufacturer already rolled into shapes suited to the various purposes for which it is designed, thus saving much time and trouble to the forger. The use of machinery also—the use of steam-power instead of leg-power, for instance—in many operations which were formerly done by "hand labor" is greatly to the advantage of the workman, since he now receives as much per dozen for the articles he makes as he did formerly, when he could only turn out one-half or two-thirds as many in a day. In such cases machinery has been the friend of the workingman, although he has been in the habit of looking upon it as his enemy.

The following table gives a fair average of what men in the various trades can earn, if working full time, at the present rate of wages:

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Railway employes:*</b>   |                  |
| Engine-drivers, twelve hours per day                                    | \$1 20 to \$1 80 |
| Firemen, twelve hours per day   | 72 to 1 32       |
| Passenger guards, per week  | 4 86 to 9 72     |
| Goods guards, per week of seventy-two hours                             | 6 06 to 7 30     |
| Pointsmen, per week of seventy-two hours                                | 5 68 to 7 30     |
| Watchmen, per week of seventy-two hours                                 | 4 86 to 6 06     |
| Passenger porters, per week of seventy-two hours                        | 3 66 to 4 38     |
| Goods porters, per week of seventy-two hours                            | 4 38 to 5 01     |
| Engine-fitters, per week of sixty-six hours                             | 6 06 to 8 52     |
| Examiners, per week of seventy-two hours                                | 6 06 to 7 30     |
| Oilers, (boys,) per week of seventy-two hours                           | 1 20 to 1 92     |
| Laborers, per week of seventy-two hours                                 | 3 90 to 4 86     |
| <b>Workers in iron, (founderies, machine-shops, &amp;c.,) per week:</b> |                  |
| Puddlers  | 7 83             |
| Assistants  | 5 34             |
| Shinglers   | 12 79 to 14 58   |
| Assistants  | 8 76 to 9 72     |
| Ball-furnace men  | 12 79            |
| Assistants  | 6 06 to 8 76     |
| Charcoal-lumpers  | 14 58            |
| Rollers   | 9 96 to 14 58    |
| Assistants  | 6 66 to 9 12     |
| Metal-refiners  | 10 92            |
| Plate-rollers   | 14 58 to 19 44   |
| Furnacemen  | 13 38 to 18 24   |
| Firemen   | 7 30 to 10 92    |
| Scalesmiths   | 8 52             |
| Forgemen  | 12 15 to 18 24   |
| Levermen  | 7 89             |
| Bogie-men   | 6 06             |
| Hammer-drivers  | 7 30             |
| Pattern-makers  | 8 26 to 8 74     |
| Molders   | 8 74 to 9 72     |
| Fettlers  | 6 78 to 7 77     |
| Laborers  | 4 86 to 6 18     |
| Iron-trailers   | 3 00 to 5 10     |
| Springfitters   | 9 72             |
| Assistants  | 4 86             |
| Tirerollers   | 9 72             |
| Machinists  | 5 82 to 8 76     |
| Joiners   | 7 30             |
| Turners, (same as machinists)   | 5 82 to 8 76     |
| Engine-fitters  | 8 25             |
| Blacksmiths   | 8 50             |
| Millwrights   | 8 00             |
| Apprentices   | 1 20 to 3 36     |
| Brassfounders   | 8 25             |
| Brassfinishers  | 7 77             |
| <b>Boiler-makers:</b>   |                  |
| Riveters and bulkers  | 7 53             |
| Holders-on  | 5 82             |
| Blacksmiths   | 7 02             |
| Flangers  | 8 00             |
| Apprentices   | 1 20 to 2 64     |
| Rivet-boys  | 1 20             |
| Laborers or helpers   | 4 86             |
| Enginemen   | 6 78             |
| <b>Steelworkers:</b>  |                  |
| Melters   | 19 50            |
| Teemers   | 9 72             |
| Pullers-out   | 8 76             |
| Cokers  | 5 82             |
| Potmakers   | 9 48             |
| Collar-lads   | 3 60             |
| <b>Fileworkers:</b>   |                  |
| Forgers   | 8 52             |
| Strikers  | 8 52             |
| Hardeners   | 7 30             |
| Grinders  | 10 94 to 13 38   |
| Cutters   | 8 52             |
| <b>Sawmakers:</b>   |                  |
| Long and circular saw smiths  | 12 12            |
| Short and circular saw smiths   | 8 04             |
| Grinders  | 12 12 to 14 58   |
| Handle-makers   | 9 72 to 12 12    |
| <b>Edge-tool workers:</b>   |                  |
| Forgers   | 13 38            |
| Strikers  | 12 12            |
| Grinders  | 14 50            |
| Hardeners   | 6 30 to 7 30     |
| <b>Pocket cutlery:</b>  |                  |
| Forgers   | 5 82 to 10 92    |
| Grinders  | 9 72 to 14 58    |
| Hafters   | 4 86 to 9 72     |
| <b>Table cutlery:</b>   |                  |
| Forgers   | 7 30 to 9 72     |
| Strikers  | 6 06 to 8 52     |
| Grinders  | 8 52 to 9 72     |
| Hafters   | 5 10 to 8 28     |
| <b>Razors:</b>  |                  |
| Forgers   | 13 38            |
| Strikers  | 10 92            |
| Grinders  | 14 58            |
| Hafters   | 9 72             |
| Putting-up women  | 1 44 to 3 40     |

\* Men in goods department work six days per week, while those in passenger department work seven days. Engine-drivers working eighteen hours get pay for two days; sixteen hours, one day and a half; fourteen hours, one day and a quarter.

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Scissors-makers:</b>                              |                |
| Forgers  | \$12 12        |
| Grinders   | 12 12          |
| Filers   | 7 30           |
| Fitters  | 7 30           |
| Holders and hardeners                                | 6 82           |
| Burnishers, women                                    | 3 36           |
| Dressers, women                                      | 3 84           |
| <b>Electroplaters:</b>                               |                |
| Stampers   | \$7 78 to 8 52 |
| Piece-workers  | 7 78 to 8 52   |
| Braziers   | 8 52 to 9 72   |
| Buffers  | 7 30 to 7 78   |
| Chasers  | 3 66 to 4 38   |
| Engravers  | 9 72           |
| Burnishers, women                                    | 2 40 to 2 88   |
| <b>Britannia-metal workers:</b>                      |                |
| Spinners   | 9 72 to 14 58  |
| Stampers   | 7 30 to 9 72   |
| Casters  | 7 30 to 9 72   |
| Makers-up  | 8 52 to 9 72   |
| Burnishers, when plated                              | 2 40 to 2 88   |
| Rubbers, girls                                       | 2 40 to 2 88   |
| <b>Building trades:</b>                              |                |
| Carpenters and joiners                               | 8 10 to 8 62   |
| Masons and bricklayers                               | 9 12           |
| Hod-carriers   | 6 06           |
| Slaters  | 9 12 to 9 62   |
| Plasterers   | 7 78 to 8 26   |
| Painters   | 7 30 to 8 52   |
| Grainers   | 9 72 to 10 92  |
| Paper-hangers  | 8 52 to 9 72   |
| Agricultural laborers, with small cottage and garden | 4 14 to 4 86   |

Mr. HISCOCK. When I rose a few moments ago I did not desire to interrupt my colleague, but I desired to inquire if there was any limit within which he would expect his prophecy fulfilled.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. It may be fulfilled in time. If not, it may be fulfilled in eternity. [Laughter.]

Mr. HISCOCK. I allude to the picture you have painted.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I did not understand my colleague.

I do not pretend to measure the future. I have no more foresight than my colleague.

Mr. REED. I do not think there should be any cross-examination on this matter.

Mr. MCKINLEY was recognized.

Mr. KASSON. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] yields that I may move that the committee rise.

Mr. RANDALL. Before that motion is put I wish to say a word.

Mr. KASSON. I withhold the motion for the present.

Mr. RANDALL. Allusion has been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEWITT] to the production of anthracite coal. Now, anthracite coal has on it no burden of tax. We can in Pennsylvania, being practically without competition, produce more anthracite coal than we can find consumers for. I think the gentleman from New York will agree with me that we can probably mine in nine months as much coal as we can sell in twelve. This arises from the superabundance of coals of various kinds throughout the United States, and I may say throughout the world.

But we are steadily increasing in securing the sale of anthracite coal by a system of railroad construction reaching the lakes on the north, reaching the southern territory, and reaching far west, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] can tell us, and we are absolutely in that way coming into competition with and reaching points for the sale of our coal situated right over the soil under which there are coals of other descriptions. I agree with the gentleman from New York when he says that we can do better for anthracite coal by keeping it as it now is, free from the burden of taxation.

Mr. KASSON. I renew my motion that the committee rise. The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts, reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 2315) to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate the question of the tariff and internal-revenue laws, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KASSON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to say that, as a result of a discussion in the Committee on Ways and Means this morning, a tacit understanding I think was reached that on Saturday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the House should be asked to go into Committee of the Whole to continue the discussion of this bill. It might be well to have an understanding in the House to that effect. It will be observed that the members of the Committee, in the exercise I think of a wise discretion, have now ceased to speak as members of the committee and have given way for the members of the House generally.

Mr. KASSON. I have no objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think it would be proper to come to that understanding.

Mr. HISCOCK. I desire to say in this connection, and in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RANDALL,] that there will be an attempt on the part of the gentleman having charge of the Army appropriation bill to bring it up for consideration to-morrow and continue the consideration of that bill until it shall

finally have been passed by the House, and I have no doubt it will take both Friday and Saturday.

Mr. RANDALL. The suggestion I made was discussed in the committee, and I supposed was agreed to by the committee, but if it be objected to I withdraw it.

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan. It is not necessary to arrange the business now for Saturday.

Mr. RANDALL. I was only seeking to arrange as to the debate on this bill. We do not want to waste too much time.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not think that this is wasting time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:  
To Mr. HARDENBERGH, till Monday next;  
To Mr. HAMMOND, of New York, for the remainder of this week;  
To Mr. MARSH, for ten days from April 1; and  
To Mr. SMITH, of Pennsylvania, for four days from to-morrow.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. WARNER obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some remarks upon House bill No. 4167, to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence. [See Appendix.]

Mr. GEORGE obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some remarks on petitions and memorials which he will hereafter present from the State of Oregon, asking for improvements on its rivers and harbors. [See Appendix.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. No. 89) for the relief of Cyrus C. Clark;  
A bill (H. R. No. 697) for the relief of Captain William D. Whiting; and  
A bill (H. R. No. 1671) for the relief of H. V. Philpott.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. No. 308) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the most accessible point within five miles of the city of Saint Charles, Missouri; had agreed to the conference asked for by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. VEST, Mr. KELLOGG, and Mr. COKE.

#### HEALTH OF OVERFLOWED REGION.

Mr. KING, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Public Health:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Public Health be instructed to investigate into the probable effect of the present overflow of the Mississippi River on the health of the people dwelling in said overflowed region, and what, if any, measures are necessary in the premises to preserve the public health in said region.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. That motion is already pending, having been submitted by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. KASSON.

#### JAMES W. MAGERS.

Mr. DAWES, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5570) to reate the pension of James W. Magers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

#### PATRICK GALLAGHER.

Mr. DAWES also, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5571) to reate the pension of Patrick Gallagher; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

#### JAMES A. GALBRAITH.

Mr. PETTIBONE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5572) for the relief of James A. Galbraith; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President; which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 28th instant, and the accompanying letter of the Superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane, submitting an estimate for a deficiency appropriation of \$20,792.51 for the support of that institution for the remaining portion of the present fiscal year.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 30, 1882.

#### INDIAN AGENTS AND INSPECTORS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message

from the President; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, including draft of a bill to amend section 2056 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the term of office of Indian inspectors and Indian agents. The subject is commended to the consideration of Congress.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 30, 1882.

#### LAND REGISTERS AND RECEIVERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 29th of March, and the accompanying letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, submitting an estimate for the additions of \$34,200 and \$20,000 respectively to the appropriations for salaries, fees, and commission of registers and receivers, and for contingent expenses, Land Office, for the next fiscal year.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 30, 1882.

The motion of Mr. KASSON was then agreed to; and accordingly (at five o'clock and five minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows, viz:

By Mr. ALDRICH: The petition of banks and bankers of Chicago, Illinois, for an early passage of the Lowell bill to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM: The resolution of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, opposing the project of a free ship-canal to connect the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, the resolution of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, protesting against the renewal of the steam grain-shovel patent—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, the resolution of the Board of Health of Philadelphia, for the passage of the bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—to the Committee on the Public Health.

By Mr. BRAGG: Memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, praying a cession of certain lands to that State to be kept as a park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRUMM: The petition of D. P. Thompson and 86 others, honorably discharged soldiers, for the passage of the bill to establish a soldiers' home at Erie, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASWELL: The petition of Edward Sanderson and 51 others, vessel-owners, protesting against the extension of the steam grain-shovel patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CORNELL: The petition of William S. Maywell and others, for the improvement of Saugerties Creek, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIN: The petition of citizens of Pennsylvania for legislation to restrict Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ERMENROUT: The petition of importers and dealers in sugar at the port of New York, for the passage of a bill imposing ad valorem duties upon sugar, as embodying the only just and equitable system for an import tax on that article—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, the petition of members of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the extension of the steam grain-shovel patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FORD: The resolution of the Central Council of the Land League of Saint Louis, Missouri, asking that American citizens now imprisoned in Ireland have a speedy trial or be at once discharged from custody—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUENTHER: Memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, relative to the donation of certain lands to the State for park purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDENBERGH: The petition of importers and dealers of sugar at the port of New York, for the passage of the bill imposing ad valorem duties upon sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWK: The petition of John Swansey and 43 others, members of Ridott Grange at Ridott, Illinois, for the passage of the bill for the protection of innocent purchasers of patented articles—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MONEY: Memorial of the Legislature of Mississippi, relative to the waiver forfeiture of grant in aid of Gulf and Ship Island Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE: Papers relating to the claim of John Pittman, of Memphis, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: The petition of W. F. Mallalieu and others, for legislation for the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL: The resolutions of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, against the extension of the steam grain-shovel patent—to the Committee on Patents.



Also, the resolutions of the board of managers of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, against the construction of the canal to connect the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, the resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Health, urging the passage of the bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—to the Committee on the Public Health.

By Mr. PHELPS: The petition of H. H. Swift and others, in favor of ad valorem duties on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Mrs. Frances S. Collins, of New Haven, Connecticut, in favor of the passage of the French spoliation claims bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POST: The petition of the governor, secretary, and other officers of Utah Territory, asking for a charter for a toll-road and ferry—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RANDALL: The resolutions of the Commercial Exchange, of Philadelphia, relative to the project for a free ship-canal to connect the waters of the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware Bay—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, the resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the extension of the patent in steam grain-shovels—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, the resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Health, in favor of the passage of the bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES W. SINGLETON: The petition of Sophia L. Dyer and others, citizens of Quincy, Illinois, praying that the said Sophia L. Dyer be restored to the pension-rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. R. W. TOWNSHEND: The petition of citizens of Hamilton County, Illinois, praying for the passage of a bill granting one hundred and sixty acres of land to the volunteer soldiers of the late war—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHN T. UPDEGRAFF: The petition of D. G. Bacon & Co., of New York, and 40 other business firms, in favor of the bill imposing ad valorem duties on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANCE: Papers relating to the claim of William D. Justus—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: The petition of Sapp, Goldsmith & Co., and a large number of other citizens of Louisville, Kentucky, for the restoration of the harbor at Vicksburgh, Mississippi—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON: The petition of W. W. Deloe, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: The petition of John Beecher, Jacob Swartz, and many others, citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, asking legislation against the immigration of coolies—to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 31, 1882.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

- A bill (S. No. 383) to amend section 4458 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to license fees of officers of steam-vessels;
- A bill (S. No. 42) for the relief of George G. Snyder;
- A bill (H. R. No. 89) for the relief of Cyrus C. Clark;
- A bill (H. R. No. 697) for the relief of Captain William D. Whiting; and
- A bill (H. R. No. 1671) for the relief of H. V. Philpott.

### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT ACCOMMODATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. No. 1361) to provide additional accommodations for the Department of the Interior, which was, in line 1, to strike out the word "twenty" and insert "fifteen" before "thousand."

On motion of Mr. ROLLINS, it was

*Resolved*, That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to said bill, and ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

By unanimous consent, it was

*Ordered*, That the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the President *pro tempore*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. ROLLINS, Mr. MORRILL, and Mr. JONES of Florida.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War transmitting a report from Lieutenant-

Colonel Craighill, Corps of Engineers, of a survey made in compliance with requirements in the river and harbor act of March 3, 1881, of James River, Virginia, for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and cost of procuring a channel twenty-five feet deep at full tide from Richmond to the mouth of the river; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting correspondence with Dallas Sanders, under resolution of the Senate of the 28th of March; which, on motion of Mr. Butler, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BROWN presented the petition of a large number of merchants of the city of Macon, Georgia, and also the petition of a large number of railroad employes, praying an adequate appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of Savannah; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of gaugers and storekeepers of the eighth internal revenue district of Illinois, praying to be placed upon an equality with other Government employes in respect of leave of absence; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LAPHAM, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 1128) to authorize the Secretary of State to allow for expenditures within named to James Rea, late consul at Belfast, Ireland, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 35) to incorporate the Garfield Memorial Hospital, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 360) to provide for a scientific exploration of the Territory of Alaska, reported it with an amendment.

### REIMBURSEMENT TO SENATOR INGALLS.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections to report the following resolution, and I ask its present consideration:

*Resolved*, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of \$8,195 to JOHN J. INGALLS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, in reimbursement of expenses necessarily incurred by him in defense of his title to his seat.

By unanimous consent, the resolution was read the second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I voted the other day against the resolution to reimburse the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. KELLOGG,] and I shall vote against this; but I take occasion to say that I know from being a member of the committee that the Senator from Kansas did incur very heavy expenses in defending himself against the accusation of fraud, and his claim is certainly entitled to be considered as much as that of the Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Louisiana.

I shall vote against this proposition because I voted against the other and because I believed then, and believe now, that it is making a precedent that we ought not to make; but in justice to the Senator from Kansas, upon whose investigation I was placed, I deem it proper that I should say that I know from personal observation that he was under great personal expense in defending himself against charges of fraud.

The resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

On motion of Mr. HALE, it was

*Ordered*, That when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

### PUBLIC BUILDING AT COLUMBUS.

Mr. ROLLINS. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 1501) for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ohio, to report it with an amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. This bill provides for the erection of a Government building at Columbus, Ohio. It is one of a series of bills which the Senate has passed, and which are on the Speaker's table of the House. I should like to have this bill, if it is the pleasure of the Senate, considered now. Columbus is really the largest State capital yet unprovided with a Government building. It so happens that we have none there.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase a suitable site, and cause to be erected thereon, at Columbus, in the State of Ohio, a substantial and commodious public building, with fire-proof vaults, for the use and accommodation of the United States district and circuit courts, internal-revenue and pension office, and for other Government uses. The site and the building thereon, when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of \$250,000; and the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of at least fifty feet, including streets and alleys; and for the purposes herein mentioned the